TRANSACTIONS

of the

Moravian Historical Society

VOLUME XVIII

Part I

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Whitefield House
Nazareth, Pa.
1961

PRINTED FOR THE SOCIETY BY
LAROS PRINTING CO.
EASTON, PA.

M797
v.28:1
1961

THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE COLONIAL AMERICAN MORAVIANS

by

EDWIN ALBERT SAWYER

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

under the

JOINT COMMITTEE

on

GRADUATE INSTRUCTION

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

May, 1956

Published by the

MORAVIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Nazareth, Pennsylvania

1961

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter *Page*

I. INTRODUCTION 1

What is Religious Experience?
John Hus and the Hussites
John Amos Comenius: a Link between the Old and the New

II. THE CENTRAL FIGURE: COUNT ZINZENDORF 18

Zinzendorf and Pietism
Life at Herrnhut
Mysticism, a Temporary Refuge

III. SPANGENBERG AND THE FIRST MORAVIAN SETTLEMENTS IN AMERICA 45

Scholar and Servant of Christ
Tragedy at Halle
Beginnings in America
Peter Böhler

IV. ZINZENDORF IN AMERICA (1741-1743), AND LATER ... 69

The Pennsylvania Synods
The Elements of Heart Religion

V. THE 1740'S—HIGH TIDE IN AMERICA, EBB IN EUROPE 89

Christian Renatus von Zinzendorf
The Wetteravian Tragedy
Heroic Years in Pennsylvania
Cammerhof, de Watteville, John Nitschmann

VI. THE LESSER LIGHTS 128

The Christiansbrunn Settlement
Life among the Colonists in Wachovia

VII. THE GOSPEL AMONG AMERICAN INDIANS 158

Life of David Zeisberger
Anthony: a Tested Servant of Christ
Isaac: Prince of the Converts

VIII. SIGNIFICANCE AND CONTINUING INFLUENCE 200

BIBLIOGRAPHY 223

PREFACE

Studies of religious experience have not been numerous, even a generation and more after the monumental work of psychologist William James. This investigation was made possible only because of the very revealing records of the early Moravians deposited in the archives of the church and because of the publication in this century of about a dozen studies, in German, of the Moravian revival of the 1720's and the personalities involved in the revival.

I am deeply indebted to the archivists of the Moravian Church, Bishop S. H. Gapp of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and Dr. Douglas L. Rights of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for their helpfulness and suggestions. Invaluable also has been the assistance of the Rev. John Fliegel, cataloguer of Indian records in the Bethlehem Archives, who is employed for special work of investigation by the Lilly Foundation.

Virtually all translations from the German have been made by the writer. An exception is a portion of the Christiansbrunn diary, which was translated by the late Rev. F. E. Schramm.

Most of the historical material included is well written elsewhere. Any originality attached to this work stems from the selection of subjects and from the effort to go behind the historical event and to try to discover the spiritual motivation.

E.A.S.

Marshalls Creek, Penna.
August 25, 1955

1

THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE COLONIAL AMERICAN MORAVIANS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For many years the Christian world has known about Moravian missions. Heroic tales have been told and re-told about the men and women who have gone to all corners of the globe in the name of Christ and of their Moravian faith. In recent years there have also been an increasing number of persons interested in eighteenth century Moravian music composed on the continent of Europe and in colonial America. Current research[1] is revealing the fact that a high grade of religious and secular music was written in the early Moravian settlements of this country. At the same time there is growing interest in the material restoration of some of the early Moravian communities like Salem, North Carolina, and Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.[2] It seems that all aspects of colonial history increase in significance as the United States grows older and it is realized that America has a history worth examining.

This dissertation has not grown out of a purely historical interest, but rather out of a desire to understand the religious experience of this remarkable group of colonial Americans. Now religious experience is a very broad subject. It could be defined as that whole area of human life in which persons find their relation to the supernatural and thereby direct their energies to the affairs of this life and their confidence concerning the life to come. It is a personal matter, as William James[3] so

1. Dr. Thor Johnson, director of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, is supervising a three-year project in this area.
2. Actual restoration of many Salem buildings has begun, with the Bethlehem project still in the stage of discussion.
3. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: Longman's, Green and Company, 1928), p. 491.

clearly analyzed it at the beginning of this century. The religious life revolves around the pivot of one's private personal destiny. At the same time, a man who rejoices only in himself is a hypocrite. To achieve any sort of sainthood, he must rejoice in God.[1]

Furthermore, though the religious life goes on to produce phenomena in individual experience, it frequently arises in the social relationships of mankind. Prayer, for example, is a common religious exercise. It reflects personal human needs, but from the days of primitive religion, it has had a social character also. Indeed, the very word "religion" illustrates the social. It comes from *religare* in the Latin, signifying "to bind fast." Man is bound fast by religion to his social group, and after that, perhaps to the supernatural beyond him. But the group is vital, and religion reaches out beyond the individual and the personal.

Now the Moravian experience of 1740 to 1770 was clearly social in character. Its area of generation was frequently the "choir" or "band," in which single men or single women, married people, widows or widowers were grouped together for mutual edification. This means that the categories of James will not be adequate for this study. We must turn from purely private and "solitary" notions of religious experience to "human history and culture, to man's institutions and customs, to vested interests and funded meanings,"[2] among the Moravians so far as we are able to discover them. As Professor Schneider reminds us, "Religion is, of course, personal, but persons are social creatures, and God, too, is both in human history and above any particular movement."[3]

It is proposed in the following pages to examine the spiritual adventure of the colonial Moravians, all the way from their dynamic leader, Count Nicholas Louis von Zinzendorf, down to the primitive Indian on the frontier. This involves the Count's religious beliefs and achievements both in this country and abroad. It considers what the other clergy preached and

---

1. Edward Schribner Ames, *The Psychology of Religious Experience* (New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1910), p. 194.
2. Herbert Wallace Schneider, *Religion in Twentieth Century America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 185.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 186.

what they thought of religion. It looks into the inner life of the man behind the plow, in charge of the storeroom and at work at the potter's wheel.

The place for the investigation to begin is with the settlement of Nazareth and Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, in 1740 and 1741. Actually, Moravian beginnings in this country go back to the year 1735, when ten members of the Church, under August Gottlieb Spangenberg, settled in Savannah, Georgia. However, this effort was abandoned five years later when the Moravians, contrary to conscience, were asked to bear arms against the Spanish in Florida.[1] The current study will continue into North Carolina to the Bethabara and Salem settlements of 1753 and 1766, concluding around 1770, except for certain events in the history of Indian missions extending down to the year 1782.

In order to mark cut still more precisely a direction for this study, special attention will be given to the time of extremes in Moravian history, the so-called "Sifting Period," which ran from 1743 to 1750. This produced a fanticism especially in Wetteravia whose effects were felt all the way across the Atlantic. Wetteravianism was fostered by Zinzendorf, by John Christoph Cammerhof and John Nitschmann. It was sensuous, emotional and fanatical, aiming to represent the atonement as an objective reality by stressing the blood of Christ, his wounds, and especially his wounded side.

Alongside this fanatical brand of Moravian experience there existed also the more conservative. Herrnhut, Saxony, where refugees from Bohemia and Moravia settled on Zinzendorf's estate as early as 1722, was its center in Europe, while Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, except for a short time around 1750, was a typical American center. The conservative was a simple and unadorned experience, evangelical, Pietistic and Christ-centered. It was represented by such men as Spangenberg, Peter Böhler and the incomparable missionary to the American Indian, David Zeisberger.

---

1. See Adelaide L. Fries, *The Moravians in Georgia* (Raleigh, N. C.: Edwards and Broughton, 1905).

As this study progresses, it will be seen that the conservative type of experience won out over the fanatical, mostly because of the quiet, yet firm influence of Spangenberg and others like him. It was not an easy victory, for fanaticism has an alarming tenacity about it. Many persons were confused during the conflict, and even the Indian could tell the difference between the contrasting approaches to religion. The economy of the colonial settlements was shaken by it, and Moravian hymnology down to the present day retains reflections of it. Spangenberg, by overcoming a natural hesitation to marry, by battling successfully a tendency toward separatism and by blending religious enthusiasm with diligence in daily toil, becomes the hero of the story.

Sources Available

Within the limits of the single generation from 1740 to 1770, there is a wealth of material available on the Moravian religious experience. Count Zinzendorf was a prolific writer, bequeathing to posterity many volumes of sermons, letters, notes and polemical works. The same thing is true to lesser degree of Spangenberg and other associates of the Count. Then there are the very remarkable diaries which most Moravian clergymen kept, including the missionaries.[1] There was a school for scribes established at Nazareth for the purpose of training men to keep good records. Many of the memoirs referred to so often in Chapter VI were written by these scribes and furnish priceless information concerning the spiritual life of the Moravian pioneers.

Not only do these sources yield quantities of information, but they have a unique quality. They are remarkably revealing of the nature of the spiritual experience then made. The analysis that is undertaken here, therefore, is by no means artificial; it was made beforehand by the Moravians of that time themselves. These people were conscious of their religious life to a high degree. They talked about it freely and wrote with particular fullness about it. At times the local scribes and copy-

1. A graduate student at Columbia University is at present working on a translation and interpretation of part of the diary of the Moravian mission at Fairfield, Ontario.

ists resorted to stock phrases, describing the thoughts and emotions of others in their own terms. But, by and large, the lives revealed to posterity and clothed with individuality.

From the viewpoint of the theologian interested in doctrine, this study will prove disappointing. The Moravians were not much occupied with doctrine. They accepted the Augsburg Confession as representing best their theology, at the same time being inclined toward the opinion that all so-called religious beliefs or doctrines are merely theories *about* the religious experience.[1] This means that each element of the experience is important and is to be considered carefully, first for its own sake, and then later as the basic of dogma. Such specific phenomena as guilt, repentance, conversion, dedication, prayer, or attitudes toward death will have place in the pages just ahead. In addition, the Moravians fashioned from their experience a world view, and they answered, at least to their satisfaction, certain key questions: What is God's purpose for man? Is the true life of man on earth or only in eternity? What part is man to play in the offer of Christ's salvation to all nations? Again, what place should true servants of Christ give to their own ambitions of vocation and property?

Another great American Christian of the eighteenth century, Jonathan Edwards, was concerned with some of these same aspects of religious experience. Said he:

> The exercises of grace, of which the believer is sensible, constitute Christian experience; and this experience consists as much in those operations of grace upon the will, by which our actions are immediately directed, as in mere mental exercises. These exercises of grace are not the less a part of Christian experience, because they are immediately connected with our actions.[2]

To Edwards, the role of the will was very important, as well as that of the mind. Man must not only give mental assent to truth, but must throw into his decision will power supported by emotion.

---

1. See W. T. Stace, *Time and Eternity* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1952), pp. 17-23.
2. Jonathan Edwards, *The Treatise in Religious Affections* (American Tract Society: New York, no date), p. 266.

The need for emotional response was one reason for the Moravian emphasis on Christ's redemption, symbolized by the cross. Many settlers around them were attracted to the Moravians because they gave meaning to the doctrine of the cross and demonstrated its power in their own lives. The same message moved hundreds of Indians emotionally and led them to seek baptism. The suffering of the Saviour was related to the suffering commonly experienced on the frontier, though Edwards complained that even that failed to move many:

> But how insensible and unmoved are most men, about the great things of another world! How languid are their affections as to these things! How insensibly they can sit and hear of the infinite love of God in giving his dear Son to be offered up a sacrifice for the sins of men; and of the unparalleled love of the innocent and holy Lamb of God, manifested in his dying agonies, his bloody sweat, his bitter cries and bleeding heart. They can bear that all this was done for his enemies, to redeem them from deserved, eternal burnings, and to bring them to unspeakable and everlasting joys, and yet be cold, insensible, and regardless.[1]

The centrality of the cross and the strong emphasis on Christ's atonement, then, are by no means claimed uniquely as Moravian experience. Others were absorbed with the same doctrines, but did not fall into some of the extremes of 1743-1750 of Moravian history. What needs to be analyzed is the degree to which 1743-1750 is representative of all eighteenth century Moravianism. It is always a temptation to feature the extreme, the unusual, the abnormal. Without either featuring or ignoring the abnormal, this study will assume that there is something normal about preaching the atonement and appearling to the will because of what Christ suffered on the cross. The fact is that so-called ordinary experiences of religious growth in adolescence and afterward are still notable. Though usually unpublicized, they have a place in this sort of study. Just because it is the remarkable conversions that are usually publicized, does not mean that they form the expected pattern for all men.[2]

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
2. Ames, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

More unique than the preaching of the cross and more typical of their eighteenth century experience than the Wetteravian extremes was the continuing life of the Moravian settlements in America and abroad, especially in reference to the "choirs." There was a mutuality of experience in the choir houses. Things of the spirit were shared, and a spiritual enthusiasm was generated. If one individual soared in his religious life, others in the group soared with him. If one youth felt led to volunteer for missionary service, others would find it congenial to follow. By fostering settlements "apart from the world" and allowing only their own members to live in their towns, the early Moravians believed they could cultivate a deeper spirituality.

The Moravian experience having thus far been classified as social, conservative, emotional and "contagious," one more characteristic needs to be added: enthusiastic. The contemporary Catholic scholar, Ronald Knox, has made a valuable contribution in his study of "enthusiasts" and rightly includes the eighteenth century Moravians among them. Beginning from a highly critical viewpoint, he sees more validity in enthusiasm than he expected. At the same time, he finds implications in enthusiasm that affect the traditional Christian doctrine of grace. He says:

> Our traditional doctrine is that grace perfects nature, elevates it to a higher pitch, so that it can bear its part in the music of eternity, but leaves it nature still. The assumption of the enthusiast is bolder and simpler; for him, grace has destroyed nature, and replaced it. The saved man has come out into a new order of being, with a new set of faculties which are proper to his state; David must not wear the panoply of Saul. Especially, he decries the use of human reason as a guide to any sort of religious truth. A direct indication of the Divine will is communicated to him at every turn, if only he will consent to abandon the 'arm of flesh'—Man's miserable intellect, fatally obscured by the Fall.[1]

It would be difficult to find a statement by the early Moravians on the subject of nature and grace. Not being disposed in the

1. R. A. Knox, *Enthusiasm* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1950), p. 3.

direction of theological definition, they may never have faced the issue in just the form in which Knox phrases it. But on the latter subject of reason versus experience, one is never left in doubt. Moravianism in the eighteenth century was a revolt against "reason religion" and became an adventure of the heart. This will come into clear focus in one of the chapters on Zinzendorf.

Roots in Europe

It will not be possible to consider the Moravian experience in America apart from its European rootage. Through the years the Moravian faith developed a unique quality in this country, especially under the leadership of men like Spangenberg, Böhler and Ettwein.[1] But in the first generation the Moravians were German Pietists before they were American frontiersmen. Their culture, like that of all first generation Americans, was rooted in Europe, and even their denominationalism was an uncertain quantity in the face of their inherited interest in the German system of a state church.

The break between Zinzendorf and the Pietists of Halle had already taken place before the Moravians arrived in America. However, Pietistic tendencies persisted, and these tendencies often led the Moravians to their unique usefulness. This is illustrated by the notion of the centrality of Christ's redemption demonstrated in the cross, as already discussed. The power of the cross motif in Moravian preaching will appear again and again in this study, and it will be remembered that this message came to these shores from Germany. However, it should be understood that the American brand of Pietism (if it be appropriate so to designated it) was a modified version of the German one. The sheer hardship of frontier life dispelled much of the fanaticism that characterized Moravianism in Wetteravia. Heart religion continued, but understanding kept it under control. Thus, once more there is a point of contact between the Moravians and Jonathan Edwards, evidenced by this passage from the *Treatise on Religious Affections*:

---

1. See Kenneth G. Hamilton, *John Ettwein and the Moravian Church during the Revolutionary Period* (Bethlehem, Penna.: Times Publishing Company, 1940).

> As there is no true religion where there is nothing else, but affection, so there is no true religion where there is no religious affection. As, on the one hand, there must be light in the understanding, as well as warmth in the affections, for where there is heat without light there can be nothing divine or heavenly; so, on the other hand, where there is a kind of light in the understanding, without warmth in the affections—a head stored with notions and speculations, with a cold unaffected heart—there can be nothing divine: that knowledge is not true spiritual knowledge of divine things. If the things of religion are rightly understood, they *will affect the heart.*[1]

There were times of wavering, as will be seen, when an extremist like Bishop John Nitschmann could temporarily displace the level-headed Spangenberg. But a balanced Moravianism soon asserted itself.

The message of the cross was channelled constructively instead of being carelessly dissipated. This can be seen clearly in early Moravian music. Men like John Frederik Peter and Bishop Johannes Herbst, well trained in Europe before they came to this country, found the Moravian atmosphere conducive to the expression of music's sublimest moods. Praise to the mighty Creator blended with solemn meditation on the passion story and the Saviour's cross. This music, as would be expected, did not originate in the first generation of Moravian colonization in America. It flourished in the two generations after 1770. But the point is that after the initial toil of clearing the land and erecting the first buildings was past, and the Moravians could take time for cultural pursuits, their earlier religious experience continued its expression in a high type of music. Whatever fanaticism had coursed in their veins when they left Europe was refined and purified by the realistic demands of the New World. Yet the legitimate faith, centered in the redemption of Christ, lingered and became the inspiration of succeeding generations.

Ethical Considerations

To understand the relation of ethics to this spiritual experience, one must take account of the roots in Europe. Like Spener and the Pietists, the Moravians magnified ethics to a degree that far surpassed Luther.

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

> His particularly Medieval conception of sin and of the wrath of God engendered an unusual joy of Christian liberty in Luther. Spener, who had no equally deep fear as Luther, felt a less gladness of liberty. Very naturally Pietist morality took the form of duty instead of joyful service.[1]

In Moravianism the element of duty ran high also, but with an element of joy mingled in it. They symbol of the Bridegroom and his party was the motive for joy. Luther's awesome God and the tortured Christ of Medieval Catholicism gave way to the bridegroom welcomed in joy by his bride, the Church. In Luther a joyful kind of religious experience was also present, but more prominent than that was the emphasis on forgiveness of sin and escape from condemnation.

The Moravians, like Spener, had a consciousness of sin and of escape from future punishment, but stressed sanctification equally with justification. The new creation and ethical communion with God through Christ were emphasized. Thus, like Pietism, one might classify the Moravian as an ethical religion. It contrasts with the religious ethics of Catholicism as well as with the liberty through justification of Luther. It was not that Luther knew nothing of such kind of religious experience or paid no attention to it, but rather that it did not from the core of his consciousness.

The position will be taken throughout this study that while the early Moravians were Pietistic in tendency, they should not be classified specifically as Pietists. For one thing, since he had no agonizing crisis between unbelief and faith, Zinzendorf's conversion was doubted by many of his Pietistic contemporaries. Spangenberg and other of the Moravian lieutenants experienced the typical crisis, but the Count preached the process of salvation as an immediate and joyful apprehension of a loving Father.[2] At the same time, the Moravian experience showed an absence of much of the Pietistic exaggeration on introspection.

---

1. Uwoki, Tadakazu, "The Significance of Philipp Jakob Spener in the Development of Protestant Thought," (Unpublished S. T. M. thesis, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1924), p. 34.
2. See W. G. Addison, *The Renewed Church of the United Brethren* (London: Society for Promotion Christian Knowledge, 1932), p. 23.

Zinzendorf criticized the self-tortures of the Pietists, and at the same time felt an equal distrust of the Wesleyan "transports."[1] The Moravians probably belong in the category of "enthusiasts," but it seems clear that their enthusiasm must be reckoned as a tempered one beside such groups as the contemporary Methodists. When Wesley visited them in Saxony, he found theirs a "Quietistic type of gentle piety."[2] Thus, as compared to the excited enthusiasm of the early Methodists, and the rigorous self-denial of the Pietists, the Moravians occupied something of a middle ground. The Bridegroom emphasis provided a note of pleasure that was missing in Pietism, but enthusiasm was usually kept within constructive bounds.

Without enthusiasm of some sort, revival is impossible. Dormant orthodoxy is a curse to any religion. Therefore, the early Moravians would like to be classed as enthusiasts of the better order, even as Jonathan Edwards says:

> From these things it evidently appears, that if affections concerning religious things, are raised to a very great height, it is no certain proof that they are not such as have in them the nature of true religion. Those persons, therefore, greatly err, who condemn others as enthusiasts, merely because their affections are very high.[3]

A further observation concerning the nature of the Moravian experience is made by Ronald Knox, that

> Moravianism is essentially neither a doctrine nor a discipline, but a spirituality. And that spirituality owes nothing to the Middle Ages; it is German Pietism refracted through the curious lens of Zinzendorf's own speculation. Like Jansenism, like Wesleyism, it is in part a reaction against the Deistic thought of the day, which offered to the human soul a barren nourishment of Christianity without Christ.[4]

---

1. J.Hutton, *A History of the Moravian Church* (London: Moravian Publication Office, 1909), p. 463.
2. *Ibid.* 3. Edwards, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
4. Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 408.

The general truth of this statement should not obscure the fact that there was discipline of a unique stamp among the Moravians. These people were not antinomians, though some of Zinzendorf's writings would point in that direction. There was strict discipline in every American Moravian community, as there had been in the earlier German settlements. The only exception to this is the Wetteravian settlement during the so-called Sifting Time (1743-1750)[1]. At this point there was a breakdown of an otherwise effective discipline, but to judge the whole by its exception would be to slip into error.

The clearest analysis that can be made of the European roots of colonial American Moravianism is through the life and thought of Count Zinzendorf. This will be done in Chapters II and IV, but, for the moment, an observation by Knox indicates the need to trace roots even beyond Zinzendorf. In general, Knox is impressed by the Moravian "enthusiasm." But the Sifting Time is the perennial stumbling block. During this era an otherwise tolerable enthusiasm disintegrated into something queer and accentric. Thereby the Moravians showed thesmselves "strange progeny for the church of Amos Comenius."[2] Here are the deeper roots of colonial Moravianism, in ancient Bohemia and Moravia, for it was there that the Unitas Fratrum or Moravian Church had its beginnings. The so-called "ancient church" will now be considered briefly in light of the experience which is of central concern to this study.

John Hus and the Hussites

Christianity first come to Bohemia and Moravia a thousand years ago through two missionaries of the Greek branch of the Church, Cyril and Methodius. However, in the year 1080 the little countries became subject to the see of the zealous Pope Gregory VII. Rome did its best to make the Bohemians conform to its ways, but the hearts of the people still clung to the customs of their fathers. They were ready at any time to welcome a

1. Full treatment of this subject is offered in Chapter V below.
2. Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 413.

reformer.[1] Finally, near the end of the fourteenth century, he appeared in the person of John Hus, forerunner of the Moravian brethren. In the country at that time there was

> strong patriotic national feeling; there was hatred of the German priests; there was a growing love for the Bible; there was lack of respect for the immoral clergy, and lack of belief in the Popes; there was a vague desire to return to Primitive Christianity; and all that was needed now was a man to gather these straggling beams together, and focus them all in one white burning light.[2]

John Hus proved to be the burning light. He fixed as the great purpose of his life a determination to understand the Scriptures. By the year 1402, when he was appointed to the Bethlehem Church in Prague, he was ripening ideas on the church that were strictly anti-papal. Only Christ himself could be regarded as the head of the church. Besides attacking Rome, Hus preached against the court and condemned its vices. When indulgences were offered for sale in 1412 by command of Pope John, Hus was exited to the deepest indignation. The priests were condemned for offering indulgences for sale and also for their loose manner of living. Only God, the bold preacher said, can forgive sin. The Bible alone is the true standard of faith, and Christ is the only true head of his church.

Rome moved swiftly, forcing Hus to appear before a general Church Council at Constance, Switzerland. After spending three and a half months in a dungeon beside a sewer on an island in the Rhine, the young priest was heard briefly, summarily condemned, then marched out of town to be burned at the stake. His ashes were cast on the Rhine in ominous symbol of the manner in which his ideas were to spread over large areas of Europe. All of Bohemia rocked in protest against what was done to the man who had become their national hero. The celebrated Four Articles of Prague were drawn up to ensure the free preaching of the Word of God and the administration of the sacrament under each kind, of bread and wine. Two major parties sprang up, the Ultraquists or Calixtines and the Taborites.

---

1. See J. Taylor Hamilton, *The Moravian Manual*, third edition (Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Company, 1901), p. 4.
2. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

The Utraquist body was constituted as the National Church of Bohemia, a semi-Romish church in character which after two hundred years of independence was absorbed by the Roman Catholic Church.

The Taborites and other Hussites were never satisfied with the Ultraquist Church, which seemed to them at best a compromise. Many of them, without taking up arms or meddling in politics, quietly went about fostering apostolic teaching, discipline and fellowship. They were especially encouraged by Peter of Chelcic, an earnest layman and forcible writer. Taking a wholly independent position, Peter wrote with moral vigor, urging a return to the simple teachings of Christ and the apostles. No institution or individual deserving it escaped his attack: the state, the state church, the clergy, the wealthy, and perhaps man's worst enemy, war. Christianity was stressed as a life rather than a creed. It is especially at this point that he projected an influence far down into the future, in Bohemia and Moravia, in Saxony and across to America.

A fraternity known as the Brethren of Chelcic grew out of his writings. This group was definitely among the forerunners of the Unitas Fratrum, according to Hutton.[1] But right around the time the Unity was formed, Peter died. A village called Kunwald, close to the old castle of Lititz on the northeast border of Bohemia, was chosen as a place of refuge for all whom Peter's writings touched, persons from all ranks of society. Under the sanction of the king the first settlement of the church of the Unitas Fratrum was organized in 1457, the forerunner of so many Moravian settlements in Europe and in America. Kunwald was organized along democratic lines before democracy was popular outside. Women as well as men were chosen for office.[2] The movement was largely a layman's movement, with delegates to a synod determining who should be ordained. An episcopate later recognized by the British Parliament as legitimate was secured from the Waldensians.

From the standpoint of religious experience, certain aspects of

1. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
2. See Adelaide L. Fries, *Customs and Practices of the Moravian Church* (Winston-Salem, N. C.: Comenius Press, 1949), p. 10.

the life of the early Brethren are important. In 1467 four principles were adopted by the members of the Unitas Fratrum as the basis of their union:

> (1) The Bible is the only source of Christian doctrine.
> (2) Public worship is to be conducted in accordance with Scripture teaching and on the model of the Apostolic Church.
> (3) The Lord's Supper is to be received in faith, to be doctrinally defined in the language of the Scripture and every authoritative human explanation of that language is to be avoided.
> (4) Godly Christian life is essential as an evidence of saving faith.[1]

The latter part of the fifteenth century and the sixteenth century were years of alternating storm and calm, of bitter presecution and intolerance by men like Ferdinand I, of heroic suffering on the part of saints like Bishop John Augusta. Political upheavals thwarted the progress of the Unity again and again, driving many of its members to Poland and farther. Then, when the Counter Reformation got under way with all its venom and bloodshed, from 1621 to 1628, Protestant churches in Bohemia were closed. Congregations were scattered and their members driven into exile. The ancient Unitas Fratrum collapsed and all but disappeared.

Nine points stand out from these early centuries as aspects of the religious experience of the ancient Unity:

1. The central position given to the Bible, the keystone of evangelical Christians of every generation.

2. Emphasis on Christ as the head of the Church, instead of a pope.

3. The value of a small group set apart from the world and allowing free rein for fraternal fellowship.

4. Strong emphasis on the cultivation of evangelical piety ethics.

5. Minimizing of personal pursuits and the giving up of personal property.

6. A large place given to the laity, even though government of the church seems to have been concentrated largely in the hands of elders or bishops.

---

1. W. N. Schwarze, *John Hus* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1915) p. 148.

7. Use of the lot (following apostolic precedent) as a vehicle for discovering God's will.

8. Willingness to cooperate with other Christians in ecumenical efforts.

9. Great interest in education, church music and congregational singing.

All of these provide points of contact between the ancient church and what is to follow. They show that there is a common spirit among ancient and later Moravians, challenging Ronald Knox's statement above (p. 16), that the eighteenth century Moravians were strange progeny of Amos Comenius.

John Amos Comenius: the Link between the Old and the New

Called by Mathew Spinka "That Incomparable Moravian,"[1] Comenius is known best to the world for his monumental work in education. He was also a bishop of the Unitas Fratrum and editor of one of its most important documents, the *Ratio Disciplinae*. The life of Comenius stretched over seventy-eight years to the time of his death in Amsterdam in 1670. Geographically, his efforts were spread over many countries: Bohemia and Moravia, Poland, Hungary, Sweden, England, Holland; and even the United States almost claimed him.[2] In addition to witnessing the Counter Reformation, he suffered greatly from the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648. For practically a century his church existed only under ground, a "hidden seed," as he called it, ready to germinate when the proper time should come.

Because Comenius believed that the constitution of the ancient Brethren's Church was basically apostolic and not schismatic, he dared both to commend it to the Church of England in a famous *Paraenesis* and to entertain the prophetic hope, despite all, that the Unity itself would be revived. To this end he worked to keep intact the episcopacy, and many years after

---

1. See Spinka's book by that title, published in 1943 by the University of Chicago Press. "That incomparable Moravian" is the title used of Comenius by Cotton Mather in his *Magnalia Christi Americana*.

2. Spinka accepts as valid the tradition that Comenius was invited by Governor Winthrop to become president of Harvard College (now University).

his death it was one of his own grandsons, Daniel Ernest Jablonsky, who officiated at the consecreation of the first bishop of the new Moravian Church.

The link between the old and the new was completed when, in July of 1727, Count Zinzendorf found a copy of Comenius' Latin version of the *Ratio Disciplinae* in a reference library in Zittau. Of this discovery he said:

> I could not peruse the lamentations of old Comenius, addressed to the Anglican Church—lamentations called forth by the idea that the Church of the Brethren was come to an end, and that he was locking its door—I could not read his mournful prayers, 'Turn Thou us unto Thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned, renew our days as of old,' (Lament. 5:21,)—without adopting the resolution: I will, as far as I can, help to bring about this renewal. And though I have to sacrifice my earthly possessions, my honors, and my life, as long as I live, and as far as I will be able to provide, even after my death for such a consumation, this little company of the Lord's disciples shall be preserved for Him until He comes.[1]

It is to Count Zinzendorf, then, that this study must now turn, for he is its central figure.

---

1. Edmund de Schweinitz, *History of the Unitas Fratrum* (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Concern, 1901), p. 605.

CHAPTER II

THE CENTRAL FIGURE
COUNT NICHOLAS LOUIS VON ZINZENDORF

Writing about the 1740's in the religious history of Pennsylvania, Julius Sachse speaks enthusiastically of Zinzendorf as "the noble missionary and evangelist, mystic and theologian, who came to our shores with the avowed purpose of spreading the Gospel among all human creatures, irrespective of race or color."[1] He says that he looms up before us at this period as one of the most heroic characters in our history. Most persons would agree that missionary and evangelist he surely was. An heroic character, also, many would call him. He was one of those men who appear made for religion.[2] But "mystic," "Pietist," "enthusiast," even "Lutheran," would all be titles for the Count that could be disputed. The fact of the matter is that he is a very difficult person to characterize or catalogue. He is often linked with Spener and the Pietists and has been called a Lutheran of Luther's stamp.[3] But a Swedish scholar recently finds him neither Pietist nor Lutheran, but belonging to a type of the earliest Catholic spiritualism.[4] It would be correct to call him a pious and munificent man, yet eccentric.[5] He is unique in history, this nobleman turned preacher. He is unique even in the history of religion.

Although he was in America only fourteen months, his religious thinking and experience are basic to the subject of this study. No one can understand the religious experience of colonial American Moravians (or that of persons in other branches of what is called the "renewed church" of the Unitas Fratrum)

---

1. Julius Sachse, *The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, Pa.: P. C. Stockhausen, 1899), I, 439.
2. Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 399.
3. Addison, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
4. Gösta Hök, "Zinzendorf's Begriff der Religion," *Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift* (Uppsala: 1948: 6), p. 4.
5. A. M. Thompson, *Great Missionaries* (London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1862), p. 47.

unless he first tries to understand Zinzendorf. During recent years Continental scholars have been much interested in the Count.[1] Now it becomes evident that he plays an important role in the American church's history also. The compass of this study does not permit an exhaustive investigation of all the interesting aspects of his life and thought. But considerable attention must be given to his first forty years. In this time the scene was set for the two significant decades of Moravianism that followed.

Zinzendorf and Pietism

Philipp Jakob Spener, the founder of German Pietism, was a personal friend of the family and was a sponsor at Zinzendorf's baptism. For years he had been urging a more spiritual preaching and a strenuous, almost ascetic Christian life for the individual and for the church. He favored the forming of small groups to cultivate a stricter and warmer life, hoping thereby to create a leaven for the whole church. This idea of *ecclesiolae*

---

1. Some of these works are helpfully enumerated on pages 1 and 2 of a pamphlet by Heinz Renkewitz, *War Zinzendorf ein Spiritualist?* (No place given: 1950). Noteworthy in this list are:

Wilhelm Bettermann, *Theologie und Sprache bei Zinzendorf* (Gotha: 1935).

Samuel Eberhard, *Kreuzes Theologie, das reformatorische Anliegen in Zinzendorf's Theologie* (Munich, 1937).

Liemar Hennig, *Kirche und Offenbarung bei Zinzendorf* (Zurich: 1939).

W. Lütjeharms, *Het Philadelphisch-Oecumenisch Streven der Herrnhutters in de Nederlanden in de achttiende Eeuw* (Zeist: 1935).

Heinz Motel, "Zinzendorf als ökumenischer Theologe," *Evangelisches Magazin*, Jg. 1949.

Oskar Pfister, *Zinzendorf's Frömmigkeit im Licht der Psychoanalyse* (Tubingen: 1911).

Kurt Placht, *Die Gestalt der Kirche nach Zinzendorf* (Herrnhut: 1938).

Gerhard Reichel, *Der Senfkornorden Zinzendorf's* (Leipzig: 1914).

Reichel, *Die Anfänge Herrnhut*: 1922).

Reichel, *Die Geschichte des 13. August 1727* (Herrnhut: 1927).

Otto Uttendörfer, *Zinzendorf's Weltbetrachtung* (Berlin: 1929).

Uttendörfer, *Zinzendorf's religiöse Grundgedanken* (Herrnhut: 1935).

Uttendörfer, *Zinzendorf's christliches Lebensideal* (Herrnhut: 1940).

Uttendörfer, *Zinzendorf's Gedanken uber den Gottesdienst* (Herrnhut: 1931).

in ecclesia was later implemented by Zinzendorf even more successfully than by Spener himself.

In his basic approach to religion, Zinzendorf owes much to Spener. Both men specialized in the religion of the heart (*Herzensreligion*). This called for a new sort of reformation, not based on exactness of dogma, but on the spread of true godliness and the cultivation of personal piety. One of the chief features of Protestantism in the seventeenth century had been its objectivism. As soon as the Reformation cast off the authority of ecclesiasticism, another authority came in which was equally external and foreign to the experiencing subject, as it was no less binding. This new authority was the Bible. It was apotheosized as had never been done before. Pietism, in turn, shifted the emphasis from objectivism to subjectivism. For Spener, as for Zinzendorf after him, true doctrine was indispensable. Yet it was far from being the first consideration and the last. The *summum bonum*, Spener says, is piety.[1]

Simply possessing a correct doctrine is not religious experience at all. Experience is more subjective. On the other hand, it would be inaccurate to say that religion is through and through a matter of feeling. Spener never said that religion had its seat primarily in the heart. Piety to him was a general attitude, the expression of a desire on the part of the religious realist for directness and warmth of religious life. There are mystical elements in both Spener and Zinzendorf. Religious experience, however, is not to be sought in mysticism, but rather in a heart religion of piety.[2] This emphasis on heart experience gave their subjectivistic tendency a fascinating feature.

---

1. Uwoki, *op. cit.*, p. 39.
2. Since the term "mysticism" is used in this chapter a number of times and will recur frequently, some explanation is probably in order. It is a dangerous term because so often used loosely. To many it is an un-Christian possibility, in that absolute, philosophical mysticism supposes the teaching of actual union of the human soul with God.

It is not in this sense that Zinzendorf was drawn to mysticism. He follows more in the stream of Pauline, Bernardine Christ-mysticism. According to Uttendörfer (see page below), his diary for September 25, 1718 says he wants to remain in constant communion (commercio) with God. It is communion, not union with God that is sought. In 1719 he found a tract by

But therewith to classify Zinzendorf unreservedly as a Pietist would be in error. It is true, that from babyhood to his majority, he lived and moved within the circle led first by Spener and then by his eminent associate, August Hermann Francke. But there came a parting of the ways, due partly to the Count's independent spirit and partly to what was happening to Pietism itself. Pietism was in the process of substituting the conception of an invariable, necessary and painful struggle for repentance as the one unalterable method of achieving reconciliation with a just and angry deity. To Zinzendorf the process of salvation should not be one of paint and distress induced by a subjective conviction of sin and guilt, but an immediate and joyful apprehension of a loving Father, persistently, yet gently leading his child into a new life of happy companionship with himself. Further strain and the inevitable parting of the ways was caused by the growth of Pietism's "methodistic moralism."[1]

Early Influences

Zinzendorf's grandfather, from whom he inherited his title to nobility, left Austria in the seventeenth century because of religious convictions. The family was settled in Dresden at the time of Nicholas' birth, but tragedy soon struck. George Louis, the father, one of the premier ministers at the court of Saxony, died just six weeks after the young count was born, which was on May 26, 1700. Four years later his widow, Charlotte Justina, Baroness of Gersdorf, remarried. Her second husband, Prussian Field Marshall von Nazmer, was stationed largely in Berlin, while little Nicholas was turned over to his aunt, Henrietta, and his grandmother, the earnest and pietistic Baroness of Gersdorf.

Christian Fried Richter on the *Origin and Nobility of the Soul* pleasant, but later rejected it as mystical.

The reader may decide on the nature and extent of his mysticism from the following poem, from his twentieth year: "I sought to bind myself to God, the highest good, the nearest it can be. Where I depended formerly on my head, I must now yield; my own will must disappear. My heart is given over to the Lord; it shall henceforth live in his likeness. . . . The Saviour, who suffered for me, remains nothing but the rule of my life. . . . I do not take pains with myself as formerly; I operate in God." (from Uttendörfer, p. 34).

1. Addison, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

These two women were a great influence on the young boy: Henrietta, a maiden lady and something of an oddity, and the Baroness, a correspondent of both Spener and Francke.[1]

The grandmother was openly unprejudiced in her Lutheranism. She quietly cherished the radical Pietistic, mystical ideals of a Christianity of love and deed, not of doctrine. These ideals she aroused in her grandson. "Already in my childhood," he says, "I loved the Saviour, and had abundant communion with Him. In my fourth year I began to seek God earnestly, and determined to become a true servant of Jesus Christ."[2] The Baroness was a long-standing acquaintance of Hochmann von Hochenau, a mystic, an associate of Gottfried Arnold, and tutor of Zinzendorf's uncle. She gave financial support to Johann Petersen, another follower of Arnold, and one who looked for some sort of apocalyptic fulfillment in the wake of the Thirty Years' War. She was also interested in interdenominational trends of the day. Late in his life Zinzendor said of her:

> I derived my principles from her. If it had not been for her, my whole situation would have been different. She was a person who spent everything in the world on what interested the Saviour. She knew no difference between the Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed religions, but what she took a fancy to, that was dearest to her heart.[3]

He wrote tender letters to the Saviour and threw them out of the window, confident that the Lord would receive them. His susceptible nature thus became evident early in his life. In his own words,

> The Saviour was the focal-point of my upbringing. . . .The old church hymns. . .are so loved by me that for forty years I have enjoyed them if they are sung according to the old style. . . .When in my sixth year. . .Herr Christian Ludwig Edeling, my tutor for three years, (1678-1742) took leave of me in the customary evening study, he used tender expressions of my Saviour and his service, and

1. See Hutton, *op. cit.*, P. 178.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Otto Uttendörfer, *Zinzendorf und die Mystik* (Berlin-Dahlem: Christliche Zeitschriftenverlag, 1950) p. 23.

> in what fashion I belonged to him. These were to me so quickly and forcefully explained that I fell into lengthy crying and resolved firmly to live entirely for the Man who has given up his life for me. In these thoughts I would converse affectionately and evangelically with my much beloved Aunt Henrietta. To her I told my whole heart, and we then carried it customarily to the Saviour.[1]

He admits not understanding his fallen human nature as a child, but in tearful prayers surrendered early to him who suffered so much for him. Lest one should call all of this a hothouse process and dub the child a precocious prig, Hutton says that at bottom his religion was healthy and sound.

> It was not morbid; it was joyful. It was not based on dreamy imagination; it was based on the historic person of Christ. It was not the result of mystic exaltation; it was the result of a study of the Gospels. It was not, above all, self-centered; it led him to seek for fellowship with others. As the boy devoured the Gospel story, he was impressed first by the drama of the Crucifixion; and often pondered on the words of Gerhardt's hymn:—
>
> *O Head so full of bruises,*
> *So full of pain and scorn,*
> *'Midst other sore abuses,*
> *Mocked with a crown of thorn.*
>
> For this his tutor, Edeling, was partly responsible. 'He spoke to me,' says Zinzendorf, 'of Jesus and His wounds.'
>
> But the boy did not linger in Holy Week forever. He began by laying stress on the suffering Christ; he went to lay stress on the whole life of Christ; and on that life from the cradle to the grave, his own strong faith was based.[2]

At School in Halle

Next to this unusual, if not to say artificial, home life, the most important influence of his youth was the five-year schooling he was given at Francke's *Paedegogium* in Halle. There, in his early teens, he organized prayer meetings as the leader of his companions. He was confirmed and attended his first service of Holy Communion. Even as late as the beginning of this century, the German hymnal of the Moravian Church included the hymn

1. *Ibid.*, taken from *Büdingische Sammlungen*, 1. Vorrede, Anm., 1740.
2. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

he wrote on the occasion of this experience.[1] He became interested in foreign missions and at fifteen established the Order of the Grain of Mustard Seed, for the promotion of the kingdom of God. Some of his associates in this order were Baron Frederick von Watteville, Melchior Schaffer of Görlitz, and John Andrew Rothe, destined to become Zinzendorf's pastor at Berthelsdorf in later years. His stay in Halle was anything but the special privilege of a spoiled boy. But at last Francke accepted him favorably and recognized his conversion. When the young Count left the Paedegogium, the master said: "This youth will some day become a great light in the world."[2]

As time went by, he looked back on Halle with considerable pain. The years there were years of unhappiness and persecution. With few exceptions, his schoolmates hated him, and his superiors were severe. But with so much adverse criticism and even persecution ahead of him, these years no doubt made him more durable. In the clubs he formed there, too, and in the covenants he made were the germs of some of his best later work. It was there that he had his first experience of the Lord's Supper, and in 1722 he told Francke that "the true Father seized his heart, and he promised now to be a different person, God willing."[3]

Advanced Study at Wittenberg

Meanwhile, his guardian uncle, brother to his deceased father, was watching the development of the youth and was not too happy about the strong influence of Pietism. Accordingly, he was sent to the University at Wittenberg, to study the science of jurisprudence and to prepare for high service in the state. Here the program included dancing, fencing and riding—all of which turned Zinzendorf into an even more rigid Pietist. But

---

1. Herman Römer in *Nicolaus Ludwig Graf von Zinzendorf* (Gnadau: Verlag der Unitats-Buchhandlung, 1900), p. 12, identifies this hymn as: "So ist es denn geschehen," "It happened therefore."

2. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

3. August G. Spangenberg, in *The Life of Nicholas Lewis, Count Zinzendorf* (London: Samuel Holdsworth, 1838), trans. by S. Jackson, p. 10, reports a fuller statement: "The contemplation of the holy, innocent, and bitter sufferings of Jesus, almost overpowered me. Hence I believed with my whole heart, that he would be merciful and gracious to me; and I not only formed the resolution to amend my life, but rejoiced like a child at the prospect of it."

contrary to what he had heard in Halle, he found here also orthodox men who loved the Lord Jesus. Even though he was supposed to be preparing for a career in law, he pursued his studies in theology too, undertaking all with prayer, and devoting many hours to the composition of hymns and spiritual poems. He devoured avidly devotional books that were "about the Saviour and religion." At the same time, he stretched his intellect while he gained acquaintance with Bayle, Euremont, Voltaire, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz and Defoe.[1] He learned to read the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek, and his diary of these years is a mixture of these languages, of French and his native German.[2]

For the purpose of this study, however, it is his spiritual quest at this time that stands out. He translated Bernard of Clairvaux's "Jesu dulcis memoria" and repeatedly set down in verse the religious inspiration that came to him. Three poems reflect Bernardine Christ-mysticism, the Lutheran sense of guilt and need for reconciliation, and always the suffering of Christ, with some emphasis on his wounds. One of the poems may be translated:

> God, my Redeemer, stand by me,
> Snatch away my hypocrisy;
> O, make me truly pure,
> Pure from all base appearances.[3]

Wittenberg naturally placed before the young student some serious conflicts. Pietism was opposed there; mystics were not in favor; men like Arndt were hated;[4] and so-called worldly amusements were accepted. The Count, nevertheless, turned his back on fencing, billiards, and cards and founded a club called the "slaves of virtue." He turned with great interest to moral philosophy, though it probably would have been better for the future if he had studied more theology. His decision was to "be a temple of God who dwells in him and holds his communion with and near him; he will be found *in Christ* (as Paul says), and so long as he remains in God, he will not sin, but will be daily purified to still more fruit."[5]

---

1. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
2. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 185.
3. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p.27.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

He now conceived a grand scheme: he would put an end to the quarrel raging between Wittenberg and Halle. He would reconcile the Lutherans and Pietists. He perceived that the truth was not entirely confined to either party. He offered himself as mediator, and his offer was accepted on both sides, though he was only nineteen! Unexpected hindrances were thrown in the way of a meeting, yet the confidence placed in him reflects the high honor in which he was held by some of the great theological minds of the time.[1] As he came to know these professors better, he found that a man could be orthodox without being narrow-minded; and they, for their part, also found that a man could be a rigid Pietist without being a sectarian prig. For his own welfare, this effort at reconciliation proved helpful. It gave him clearer insight into human nature and caused him to discover some of the evils that arise from misconception and contradiction. It taught him the importance of truth, and, most of all, it set him to reading Luther more avidly.

His Early Travels

Leaving Wittenberg in 1719, he set out on his grand tour, which was supposed to give the final polish to a nobleman's education. He went first to Frankfurt-on-the-Main and thence to Dusseldorf, where in a picture gallery he saw and admired the beautiful Ecce Homo of Domenico Feti. Beneath the picture he read the thrilling appeal: "All this have I done for thee. What hast thou done for me?" The effect on the young man was overwhelming. He resolved deep in his soul to follow Christ who had worn the cruel crown of thorns—for him!

The grand tour continued to Utrecht, where he spent six months in further study of law and theology. He was introduced to William, Prince of Orange, and visited Brussels, Antwerp, Rotterdam, and Amsterdam. Then came six more memorable months in Paris. He attended the Court levee[2] and was presented to the Duke of Orleans, the Regent, and his mother, the Dowager Duchess. "Sir Count," said the Duchess,

1. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 185. Cf. Enoch Pond, *Memoir of Count Zinzendorf* (Boston: Massachusetts Sabbath School Society, 1851), pp. 15, 16.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 186, 187.

"have you been to the opera today?" "Your Highness," he replied, "I have no time for the opera." He would not spend a golden moment except for the golden crown. "I hear," said the Duchess, "that you know the Bible by heart." "Ah," said he, "I only wish I did."

The outstanding acquaintance made in Paris was with the Catholic archbishop, Cardinal Noailles, with whome he thenceforth carried on a correspondence until the Cardinal's death. With other French prelates, he says: "We were together for half a year with heavenly pleasant hearts, and we did not consider of what religion one or another was.[1] This was the time when he began to read Fenelon, whom he later felt called upon to defend, in connection with his persecution. He learned to know Madame Guyon's work, and certainly this combination of Quietism, Catholicism, and mysticism left its mark on the man. By 1735 he was urged by relatives to clarify his position, resulting in his treatise, "Theological Epistles Respecting the Errors of Mystics."[2]

Out of his travel time came Zinzendorf's resolve to engage in no party action. This was much the radical-Pietistic, mystical viewpoint of Arnold and others. In a letter to Cardinal Noailles, dates September 24, 1723, he said:

> far from falling into sectarianism, I have rescued myself from it, perceiving that the kingdom is neither here nor there, but quite to the contrary, it is within us. I appoint as your *rendezvous* the heart of our Saviour, and, for guide, His holy life. . . .A dying man will turn only to the merits of Jesus Christ. I do not believe, Monsignor, that your priests know a better, nor that they commend any other in the hour of death. That being so, would it not be most fair and seemly to leave there all our controversies, and to reunite in the *wounds of our Saviour*?[3]

One further contact should be introduced at this point, although it was not part of the grand tour: his visit to Ebersdorf in February and March, 1721. Not only was Petersen active in the city, but so were Marquard and Hochmann, his house friend.

---

1. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
2. *Ibid.* 3. Addison, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

The Count felt that Ebersdorf encouraged both a mystical and a more conservative Pietism than Halle and was proving a blessing both in doctrine and practice. "We must have Ebersdorf and Halle,"[1] he decided. Finally, here at Ebersdorf Zinzendorf saw the idea of *ecclesiolae* and settlements for common blessing in operation. He would in future years carry these settlements onto a much larger scale.

The "central figure" had now reached his majority. His marriage to Erdmuth Dorothea, Countess of Reuss, took place shortly, viz., on September 7, 1722. What is to be said for his development up to this point and for his essential Christian experience? Uttendörder is probably correct that these were years of reaching out, borrowing from others, tasting fruit from many different baskets. The years when he was to become self-dependent were just ahead. For a youth, his religious experience had been rich. In no way divorced from his intellectual and social development, his religion went along with him, wherever he went. He had encountered orthodox Lutheranism, at least from a layman's standpoint, and he had had ample opportunity to observe Pietism. He had soon to make some precise decisions concerning which of these two influences would be predominant in his life and thought. Having discovered that he had much in common with Quietists, mystical Roman Catholics and others, what importance would he give to particular creeds? Or would he set all creeds aside? His religious experience was above all Christ-centered. He had not been required thus far to define this in precise theological terms, but this would have to come. The atonement also loomed large in his thinking and devotion, along with the wounds of Christ. In the moral realm, he had already achieved almost model character, yet without evidence of prudishness. He exhibited a sense of sin and self-examination, but was not preoccupied with either one. He was convinced that God had a high purpose in mind for him and was resolved somehow to fulfill this purpose. And to the consternation of most of his family, this would have to find expression in a religious rather than in a legal career.

---

1. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

The Founding of Herrnhut

For ten years after he became of age, Count Zinzendorf yielded to pressure from his family, especially from his grandmother, to serve the state in law, rather than the state church, which was his preference. In the same year that he was married he took a post as King's Councillor at Dresden, at the court of Augustus the Strong. Though the clerical calling was then considered to be beneath the dignity of a noble, there was nothing to prevent him from holding Sunday afternoon meetings in his home. These he held regularly while in Dresden. They lasted from three o'clock until seven and were open to the public. All classes came for the reading of a passage of Scripture and to talk in a free-and-easy fashion on spiritual topics.

But while he was in and out of Dresden, something larger occupied his interest. Also in 1722, he purchased from his grandmother the little estate of Berthelsdorf, which lay about three miles from her home at Hennersdorf. He seems to have planned to work among the peasants on the land, and with them in mind installed John Andrew Rothe as his Lutheran pastor. When Rothe was introduced, the induction sermon was preached by Pastor Schafer, the Pietist from Görlitz. He used prophetic words, saying: "God will light a candle on these hills which will illuminate the whole land."[1]

Little did Schafer (or Zinzendorf) realize what people would be the means for fulfilling this prophecy. They came across the Bohemian frontier, Protestant refugees from Bohemia and Moravia. They came first in small groups; about ten were in the vanguard, led by Christian Dawid.[2] Two years later eighteen more were allowed to come. By the early 1740's there were six hundred, under-cover members of the ancient Unitas Fratrum. They were allowed to settle on the slopes of the Hutberg, part of the estate, and there they developed the settlement called Herrnhut, "the watch of the Lord." All of this was made possible by the generosity of Zinzendorf, who was moved by their bitter cup of persecution and their desire for religious freedom.

1. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
2. Recent research shows this to be the correct spelling, rather than "David." See Renkowitz, *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

As the settlement grew, their own leaders and pastor Rothe, but chiefly the Count, guided them into a kind of communion of saints, a free and social monasticism, without celibacy. The settlers sought to live the Christian life under peculiarly favorable conditions and apart from the "grosser temptations." As the rumor spread in the surrounding country that the estate had been offered as an asylum for persecuted Protestants, all sorts of non-conformists came to make Herrnhut their home: those with a touch of Calvinism, disciples of the sixteenth century Anabaptist, Caspar Schwenkfeld, vague evangelicals from Swabia, dissatisfied Lutheran Pietists from near at hand. The result was dissension within the camp. A ringleader of discord and theological dispute was a crank named Kruger, who had been excluded from Lutheran communion at Ebersdorf. Before he lost his mind and had to be institutionalized in Berlin, he managed thoroughly to upset the settlement, turn them away from the parish church at Berthelsdorf, and even to set many against their patron, Zinzendorf.[1]

The latter suddenly realized that strong steps must be taken to keep Herrnhut under control. Public notice was given that no refugee was to settle at Herrnhut unless compelled by persecution. Secondly, the refugees themselves promised that in all their gatherings they would remain loyal to the Augsburg Confession. The Count had no thought of their becoming a separate denomination, much less of joining the Unitas Fratrum himself. But a notable communion service on August 13, 1727 transformed everything in the community. Animosities were forgotten, a firm conviction developed that they were one in the Lord, and there was born in the hearts of the Moravian members of the community a strong desire to have the Unitas Fratrum officially revived. This, Zinzendorf, as a warmly attached Lutheran, steadily opposed, but finally agreed that the question should be submitted to the Lot. After earnest, united prayer

1. Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-204.

seeking the Lord's guidance and with full consent that unreserved obedience would be given to God's will as revealed, the decisive lot was drawn. With thanksgiving and joy, the assembly learned that God meant the United to be renewed.[1]

Something with more ardor than was characteristic of most Lutherans and having a larger place for laymen was then organized. An hourly intercession was instituted and lasted for over a hundred years. The whole day was parceled out, and each brother or sister took a turn at private prayer so that the "fire on the altar" should not burn out. Although a ministry with the three historical ranks of bishop, presbyter, and deacon was preserved, laymen retained a large share in the government of the community. A common board, with which Zinzendorf conferred for years and which he probably dominated, administered the affairs of the community. A choir system was instituted, wherein all the single men, the single women, widows and widowers were banded together respectively for special meetings, spiritual and otherwise. Married couples, while living in homes of their own, also formed "choirs." An elaborate and in many respects beautiful liturgy soon voiced their public worship.[2]

Six detailed reasons for the Count's permitting this unique organization, more or less within the jurisdiction of the Lutheran Church, are cited by Spangenberg. The gist of them is that he believed that the Moravian Church, with its honorable earlier heritage and its present well-knit fellowship, had a unique spiritual service to render the world. Democratic principles were established for the life of the community; all vassalage was abolished; civil allegiance was insisted upon; no meetings were permitted to be held without light; and the rules that "every inhabitant shall work, and eat his own bread; but he that is unable to do so from age, sickness, or liability, shall be supported by the community."[3]

---

1. Pond, *op. cit.*, pp. 58, 59.
2. Williaton Walker, *Great Men of the Christian Church* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1928), p. 311.
3. Spangenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 81, 82, 107, 108.

A society of such a nature existing on his estate naturally intrigued the Count and challenged him to give more and more of his time to its development.[1] He began to seek the peculiar talents of each individual member of the Church. After his grandmother's death and his resignation from state service, he gave much time to the choirs and bands. He held a conference weekly or once a fortnight with the men or women in charge of the choirs; and he expected in these conferences a report, oral or written, respecting every individual member of the choirs.

His Ideas on the Church

A subject anticipated by all the above must now be given specific consideration: What was Zinzendorf's concept of the Church? If he had never thought the matter through before, the years 1726 to 1728 must surely have forced the issue. His dilemma was that on the one hand he believed God wanted him to establish a brotherly fellowship (*Oeconomie Gottes*) similar to that at Ebersdorf, while on the other hand he hesitated to see the Moravians become Separatists.[2] The bond of union at Herrnhut was not a doctrine, as with so many other churches. It was a *personal experience.* "What bound the Moravian Brethren to each other was the deep, emotional, and personal relationship of each individual to the person of Jesus. The one essential to a Herrnhuter was the 'blood and merits of the Lamb of God.' "[3] There was considerable feeling that creeds had failed. Experience must succeed. If it was doubtful that the evangelical church could unite on the basis of creed, why not try to unite it on the basis of experience? At the Synod of Marienborn, in 1740, a three-fold experience was outlined. There should be a common experience of their own misery and sins, a common experience of the redeeming grace of Christ, and a common experience of the redeeming grace of Christ, and a common experience of the religious value of the Bible.[4] This personal experience was to be the one essential; no doctrine was to be imposed. None of the

1. Pond, *op. cit.*, pp. 81, 82.
2. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
3. Koppel S. Pinson, *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), p. 25.
4. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

standard creeds was final, although it will be seen that this view was modified and the Augsburg Confession accepted.

Zinzendorf had studied the philosophical works of Spinoza and Bayle, among others, and came away disgusted. Through philosophy no universal experience was possible. He arrived at the conclusion that the only way to teach men to love God was to preach the Creator of the world under no other guise than that of a wounded and dying Lamb. He said that the suffering Christ on the cross was the one perfect expression and revelation of the love of God. He went so far as to say that the title, "Lamb of God," was the favorite name for Christ in the New Testament. The central doctrine of the faith therefore became the "ransom" paid by Christ in his sufferings and death. Without demanding a rigid doctrinal confession, the Count nevertheless preached one; and he taught his Brethren to preach it as well. It was the famous "blood and wounds" theology.

"Zinzendorf reconciled his renewal of the Unitas with his idea of the Church as an invisible Body, a mystical entity transcending all eccelesiastical divisions."[1] This attempted unification is regarded by Addison as Zinzendorf's greatest single purpose and probably the point at which he made his chief contribution to our age. "So far from becoming the leader of a little sect Zinzendorf finds himself a member of a world-wide fellowship of which the little group at Herrnhut is a microcosm."[2]

Christ's function toward the Church is to prepare his Bride, whom he has won. The congregation owes its formation to the death of its Husband; it is the Bride. Things are given to the congregation daily by the Holy Ghost, as agreed upon by the heavenly Conference. Then the picture becomes ever more symbolic and complicated. Zinzendorf speaks of the pregnancy (*Schwangerschaft*) of Jesus. Out of his side-wounds are begotten the justified souls elected to a life of fellowship by the Holy Spirit. They are added to the Saviour's family, and an analogy to the formation of man from Adam's rib, in Genesis 2, is established.

---

1. Addison, *op. cit.*, p. 24. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 27.

Hennig observes that: "The image of the formation of the soul out of the side wounds is born out of the practical need for the care of souls, the connecting link for finding the practical spiritual life and for the preaching of redemption."[1] The side-hole is the place of peace, to which the congregation aims again to be.

This points forward to one of the most significant aspects of Zinzendorf's idea of the Church: fellowship or community (*Gemeine*). The Christian experience, as noted above, must be an individual, personal matter. Yet God has created us for community (*Gemeinschaft*).[2]

> Here was a new phenomenon in the expansion of Christianity, an entire community, of families as well as of the unmarried, devoted to the propagation of the faith. In its singleness of aim it resembled some of the monastic orders of earlier centuries, but these were made up of celibates. Here was a fellowship of Christians, of laity and clergy, of men and women, marrying and rearing families, with much of the quietism of the monastery and of Pietism but with the spread of the Christian message as a major objective, not of a minority of the membership, but of the group as a whole.

. . . . . .

> The Moravians never sought to bring all other Christians into their Church. After the Pietist pattern, they wished to be a leavening and transforming influence in other communions. As such, they had widespread effect.[3]

As time went on, there are those who feel[4] that the Moravian idea of communal life exercised an influence upon German Protestantism that was unique during the Era of Enlightenment. The very remoteness of their settlements gave them protection against the tendencies of the age, and the further they progressed in their tranquil development, the greater was the confidence of others in their cause. To some, the communal life was too insular. John Wesley visited Herrnhut in the summer of 1738 but renounced the Pietistic sort of organization. To him church

---

1. Liemar Hennig, *Kirche und Offenbarung bei Zinzendorf* (Zürich: University of Zürich, 1938), p. 91.
2. Pinson, *op. cit.*, elaborates on this; see pp. 67, 68.
3. Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* (New York: Harper's, 1939), III, pp. 47, 48.
4. Earl Mirbt, on "Pietism," in *The News Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1911), IX, 66.

organization was just a means for bringing people into the body of Christ and had no special benefit for its own sake. Among the Moravians,[1] the benefits of fellowship were cultivated for their own sake among both noblemen and common folk.

Finally, Zinzendorf's idea of the Church is eschatological. The plan of the typical Moravian buying around (*Gottesacker*) is the congregation's most beautiful expression of eschatology. Each member's body rests like the other, and by choir. Man and wife are separated during the time of expectation (*Erwartung*). They are in their spiritual order with the whole church, to be gathered to the choirs above. Hennig points out that the words of the Moravian liturgy express the union of the church below with the church above.[2] "The invisible church, the congregation of the perfect (*Vollendeten*), waits as a congregation upon earth as a bride to be brought to her bridegroom, to sleep in his arms." The Church is one in heaven and on earth, a "synagogue," drawn from Christ and to Christ.

Mysticism a Temporary Refuge

It is at this point that note should be taken of Zinzendorf's departure from straight-line Pietism. This was a gradual process and began almost as soon as he left the Halle school at age fifteen. While he was travelling in Paris he made the strange complaint that people who were unable to discriminate called him a Pietist, while those to whom this name was officially given would not let him pass for one. It must be emphasized that he was too much of an individualist to be confined to any one school of thought or practice. Yet for the first twenty-five years of his life his overwhelming sympathy was surely with Pietism. As long as Francke lived (that is, until 1727), they corresponded, and when Francke died, Zinzendorf was so deeply affected that he wrote what Spangenberg called an "incomparable poem" upon him.[3]

---

1. Martin Schmidt, "Die ökumenische Bedeutung John Wesleys," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, August-September, 1953, col. 451.

2. Hennig, *op. cit.*, p. 95. For example, present day Moravians pray: "And keep us in everlasting fellowship with the Church Triumphant, and let us rest together in Thy presence from our labors." (*Hymns and Liturgies of the Moravian Church*, Bethlehem, Pa., 1920, p. 16).

3. Spangenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

With the development in Pietism, after Francke's death, of a party spirit, Zinzendorf's attitude to it became less cordial. From being his friends, the Hallensian Pietists turned to be obstructionists.[1] Also, during the period 1729-1734, the Count found himself inclined to oppose the doctrines of Johann Conrad Dippel, as set forth in the latter's *Vera demonstratio evangelica*. He had a lively correspondence with Dippel, which shows their fundamental agreement in emphasizing the atonement, and in connection with the atonement, the love of God.[2] But on the subject of mysticism and on the matter of separation from the state church, Zinzendorf could not agree. Dippel had separatist principles which Zinzendorf could not accept and he also practiced a mysticism of the type the Count was gradually to resist.

The influence upon Zinzendorf of the Halle type of penitential piety has always been recognized. But this is known now not to account fully for the inner working of his mind and spirit. "He long dwelt in the dark beliefs of the mystics."[3] This may be interpreted in its worst sense. In his early twenties he evidently felt drawn toward a brand of absolute mysticsim. In 1723 his esteem for Johann Arndt ran high, even though it faded again within ten years. And, in the Berthelsdorf hymnal of 1725, he included a definitely mystical hymn of Arnold's entitled, "Als ich das Nichts wohl nahm in acht." Although he regarded the hymn critically soon afterward and rejected it, he himself also wrote a hymn in 1726 on the blessed non-existence (*selige Nichts*, a familiar expression of the mystics). But the *Nichts* does not have the traditional mystic meaning; it applies to the achievement of humility. This, says Bettermann,[4] is characteristic of how Zinzendorf used terms ("blessing Nothing," "naked soul," etc.) but changed and improved them. The parallel strophes set down by Bettermann make the revision of the mystical *Nichts* quite impressive. The "Nothing" becomes

---

1. Addison, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
2. See Josef Müller, "Zinzendorf," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1911), XII, 515.
3. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
4. Wilhelm Bettermann, *Theologie und Sprache bei Zinzendorf* (Gotha: Leopold Klotz Verlag, 1935), pp. 27-31.

"simplicity" (*Einfalt*). This grace is the rock on which all else is founded. But even the revision of the poem was not sufficient in the Count's judgment. He removed it altogether by 1753. In this, according to modern opinion, he was wise. There is no room in the evangelical faith for anything smacking of absolute mysticism.

At the same time, there is always room for the sense of intimate communion with God, unfortunately designated by many as "practical mysticism." Dr. Frederick C. Grant has called this kind of "mysticism" the "over-drive of the soul."[1] In this limited sense many evangelicals could agree with Baron von Hugel that there are three essential qualities belonging to full and corporate Christian life. They are the institutional, the doctrinal or intellectual, and the mystical.[2] C. J. Wright finds the institutional ancestor of Zinzendorf, John Amos Comenius, bishop of the ancient Unitas Fratrum, accepting this. "Such an emphasis, with its comprehensive conception of the ideal both for the individual and for the Chruch, was in complete harmony with the spirit and teaching of Comenius."[3]

It seems clear that Zinzendorf's inclination toward mysticism came as a result of his distrust of reason. In 1726 the *Dresdener Sokrates* published by the Count had two main theological expressions: (1) God must reveal himself as man, if men are to be linked to him; (2) Holy Writ is the Word of God.[4] The fact that a rationalistic system allowed for neither caused him to voice a protest as long as he lived. In July 30, 1747 sermon at at Marienborn he says, in an analysis of philosophers: "They must grant us two lines: that there is a Saviour, and that he is the Creator." But he mentions no philosopher who could satisfy him on these points. And so, Bettermann concludes: "The philosophers' unwillingness to admit the Bible was the last ground

---

1. This expression was used in a class at Union Theological Seminary, New York, during the spring semester, 1953.
2. Friederich von Hugel, *The Mystical Element of Religion* New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1908), II, 12.
3. C. J. Wright, *Comenius and the Church Universal* (London: Herbret Barber, no date), pp. 21, 22.
4. Bettermann, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

for Zinzendorf's anti-rationalism."[1] Henceforth his expression would be more and more sensuous and non-philosophical.

According to Bishop Gapp, Bayle is the only philosopher whose work Zinzendorf studied after 1727. Bayle was as keptic in religion on the basis of reason, and Zinzendorf was especially interested in his historical-empirical method. He quoted Bayle more frequently in his later writings, though seldom by name, than any other philosopher.[2] He seemed delighted by the unsparing criticism made of other philosophers. Hennig claims[3] that Zinzendorf is the most modern and also the most radical of all the doubters of the Enlightenment, and adds that his "heart religion" may well arise out of his radical Enlightenment doubts. From this Hennig draw two conclusions: that Zinzendorf as a deepest radicalism may lead to a relative victory over the Enlightenment. Perhaps one could say that the usual Enlightener doubts his faith and believes his doubts, while Zinzendorf doubts his doubts and believes his belief."[4]

When Uttendörfer began delving into the spiritual tendencies of the Countess, Erdmuth, he may have brought to the fore one reason for the survival of mystical tendencies in Zinzendorf. In the Count's *Lebenslauf* of his wife, he records:

> The celebrated Hochmann from Hochenau was a blessed teacher of hers. He quite properly held before her the merit of Christ and impressed upon her the worth of his wounds. She brought these quite orthodox principles to us and contributed most in that from the beginning, the principles have not been lost.[5]

With this analysis of Zinzendorf's "mysticism," the second main portion of his life is closed. Uttendörfer calls this period the time when he became self-dependent. Formal Pietism no longer held him. True mysticism could not claim him. The Moravians gained him as their chief spiritual guide. His place

---

1. *Ibid.*
2. S. H. Gapp, "Zinzendorf on Reason Religion and Heart Religion," an unpublished manuscript written May, 1950, pp. 2, 3.
3. Hennig, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-69.
4. Gapp, *op. cit.*, p. 4
5. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

in Lutheranism will soon be described. No one could deny that traces of his earlier years continued. In the London song book of the Brethren, 1753, there are hymns based on John 14-17. "Jesus the Bridegrooms will embrace us. Hallelujah, that Thou, invisible Master, art so visibly near us! The single calamity of a child of God is if the Lamb in his chamber does not play with sweet glances."[1] In this can be seen a survival of the mystic's lament over the withdrawal of the vision. But this is a practical mysticism, concrete in its nature, an outgrowth of the thought and imagery of the Fourth Gospel. To classify Zinzendorf, therefore, as a true mystic is inaccurate. He was a man of intense devotional fervor, having mystical tendencies, but scarcely a mystic in the true sense of the word.

Banishment from Saxony

In May of 1736, Zinzendorf was banished from Saxony by edict of King Augustus III. In this royal decree he was accused of three serious violations: he had introduced religious novelties; he had founded conventicles (secret or illicit meetings for worship by non-conformists); and he had taught false doctrine.[2] Eearly in 1732 the Court of Saxony had sent a commission of investigation to Herrnhut, largely because in the previous year seventy new Moravian exiles had arrived. The Count was absent at Copenhagen at the time, but was accused of sending emissaries into Moravia to seduce people to emigrate. Baron von Gersdorf, head of the investigation commission, addressed a letter to Herrnhut afterward, expressing his entire satisfaction with what he found, his high esteem for Count Zinzendorf and the elders of the congregation, and his favorable opinion of its members.[3] A second commission, arriving in the month the Count was banished, came to the conclusion that the Brethren were most desirable Lutherans, and might be allowed to stay. Dr. Valentine Löscher, one of the commissioners, burst into tears. "Your doctrine," he said, "is as pure as ours, but we do

1. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
2. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 232.
3. Pond, *op. cit.*, pp. 64, 65.

not possess your discipline."[1] The banishment seems to have been a compromise. It kept good workmen on the Herrnhut estate and maintained a solid source of tax revenue. At the same time, it moved sharply against the chief object of complaint, the Count.

He bore the stroke with meekness and fortitude, though it meant separation from brethren who had endeared themselves to his heart. At the same time, he believed that his exile was divinely appointed. There was work to be done abroad. As a pilgrim without a continuing city he now set out to accomplish it.

Thirty miles from Frankfurt-on-the-Main, in the district known as the Wetterau, or Wetteravia, there stood two old ruined castles called Ronneburg and Marienborn. The Counts of Isenburg, who owned the estate, were deeply in debt, and had as their tenants fifty-six "dirty families of Jews, tramps, vagabonds and a mongrel throng of scoundrels of the lowest class."[2] When they heard of Zinzendorf's banishment from Saxony, they offered him their estates on lease. Here among a squalid people the Count decided to make a new base, against the advice of Christian Dawid and others. A settlement modelled after Herrnhut was laid out and named Herrnhaag. A unique life developed here, and with it a peculiar religion.

Meanwhile, the Count's busy mind went to work on the legal problem confronting the Brethren. In Saxony he had been condemned as a heretic. What would the Prussians and their king, Frederick William I, think of him? He wrote to the king requesting examination in doctrine by qualified divines of the state church. Frederick William accepted, and after three days' conference announced to his court:

> The devil himself could not have told me more lies than I have been told about this Count. He is neither a heretic nor a disturber of the peace. His only sin is that he, a well-to-do Count, has devoted himself to the spread of the Gospel. I will not believe another word against him. I will do all I can to help him.[3]

---

1. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 232.
2. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 255.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 258.

The king encouraged Zinzendorf to become a bishop of the Brethren. So did John Potter, Archbishop of Canterbury, whom the Count especially visited. Two Berlin divines then conducted the examination of his faith, and full approval was given. On May 20, 1737, he was consecrated a bishop of the Brethren's Church by Bishop Daniel Ernest Jablonsky, court preacher at Berlin, and Bishop David Nitschmann.

In order to make clear what a remarkable situation had now been created, certain events in 1733 and 1734 must be reviewed. In April, 1733, August Gottlieb Spangenberg, the most remarkable Moravian of the eighteenth century (next to Zinzendorf), arrived in Herrnhut. Two months later Oettinger of Tübingen, another splendid scholar, arrived. Under these two, Zinzendorf pursued a systematic course of theological study, hoping to gain standing as a regular Lutheran clergyman. The following year, in connection with filling a position as tutor, he was invited to preach in Stralsund on April 11. Later that month he was given a formal examination in all points of Christian doctrine, and on the 26th the examiners gave him a complete certificate of orthodoxy from the Lutheran standpoint. Express exception, but allowable, was given to his ideas on church discipline, not contained in the articles of faith and therefore regarded as non-essential details.[1] He then notified Superintendent Löscher of his purpose to enter upon the spiritual office. The faculty of Tübingen had given Herrnhut a clean bill doctrinally the year before, so the Count's request was granted. Chancellor Pfaff commented in his official notification of Zinzendorf that a precedent was being set in a nobleman's assuming clerical status. On the fourth Sunday in Advent, 1734, then, he preached in the cathedral and in Tübingen's church of St. Thomas. He thus publicly entered the ministry.[2]

After his consecration as a bishop, therefore, Zinzendorf was in a seemingly contradictory position. He was an ordained Lutheran pastor elevated by the Brethren's Church to the office of bishop. And yet, Jablonsky in Berlin was in the same dual

1. J. Taylor Hamilton, *A History of the Moravian Church* (Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Times Publishing Co., 1900), p. 68.
2. *Ibid.*

position. For the benefit of the Moravians both were qualified to ordain ministers.

The deeper question for the purpose of this study is: "How Lutheran was Zinzendorf actually, and to what degree do his own faith and life fit into the pattern of the church which reared him?" The first consideration here is stated bluntly by Bettermann: "Zinzendorf surely had theological ideas, but no unified theology."[1] In his *Sokrates*, Number 231, 1726, he himself said that he had no systematic head.[2] He uttered ideas rather than formulated a theology. In this way, one of his early biographers, Schrautenbach, fits together his works. Much is demanded of the hearers, not only because of strange expressions, but also because of difficult trains of thought. The color of his theology changes, to invite attention. It is easily adaptable to the comprehension of the common man, and to circumstances.

His theology had a categorical norm: the doctrine of salvation. But one of his failureswas not throwing a bridge from his theology across to others of the time.[3] He felt that intellectualized theology, like rationalizing, led only to thrashing out straw. This caused him, as an anti-rationalist to swim against the stream of his time. In defense, he writes in the *Anhang* to the *Deutsches Sokrates*, 1732: "Less depends on the truth in ideas than the truth in sensation."[4] The way of empirical knowledge is primary. Experience and feeling are more important to religion than reason and abstract conclusion. Zinzendorf was, therefore, the first to introduce feeling into theology, says Bettermann, as the principle of knowledge.

By September 9, 1739, he could say: "Today I have become a firm Lutheran, and if I insist on a Schadian earnestness, I thus make it lightly Lutheran."[5] Addison says he was a Lutheran of Luther's stamp in more ways than one. Each, perhaps in his own sphere, might be described as a progressive conservative, searching for ways to graft the new upon the old and reluctant to welcome change whether in doctrine, ceremony or the consti-

---

1. Bettermann, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 8. 3. *Ibid.*, p. 10. 4. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
5. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 19. Johann Kaspar Schade (1663-1698) was a friend of Francke's.

tution of society. Both passed almost reluctantly from profound interior spiritual experiences to the task of embodying the new doctrinal conceptions there attained in new ecclesiastical institutions. But in nothing is Zinzendorf so like Luther as in his fundamental position that only in and through Jesus the Christ men find God. Other and lesser ways to certainity, to pardon and peace are a superfluous snare. Christ is not only the object but also the subject of the Bible. He is the *olon*, the all. So the person of Christ is also the starting point of a true-to-the facts understanding of the Bible.

Lutheranism Becomes Fixed

It was in 1748 that Zinzendorf persuaded the Brethren to make the Augsburg Confession their official statement of faith, although they had inclined in that direction for years, and he himself subscribed to it all his life. He composed elaborate discourses on the Confession in 1747-1748. Be this as it may, it would be fair to say that Zinzendorf's orthodoxy has been under suspicion for well over two centuries. In his own time, these suspicions were mixed with political currents. He was also a target of attack for those who felt that his noble status did not mix well with the clerical.

In this century the attacks may continue from men like Hök, who regards the Count's binding of grace by the "inner word" as evidence of his having an idea of faith akin in principle to the Catholic position, spiritualistic, heretical, and definitely not Lutheran.[1] At least it is clear that the man himself regarded his Lutheranism as fixed:

> I am and shall remain united with the Moravian Brethren who have embraced our Christian Gospel heartily, and have called me and other brethren into the service of their church. Yet I do not separate myself thereby from the Lutheran church, for I can continue God's witness in her communion. I can tie my testimony to no denomination; the whole earth is the Lord's, and men's souls are all his. I am a debtor to all.[2]

---

1. See Hök, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-36.
2. H. E. Schmieder "Zinzendorf," *Lives of the Leaders of Our Church Universal (Later Leaders)*, Ferdinand Piper, editor, p. 475.

As compared to the Pietists, Zinzendorf was more at home in the state church, and his doctrine and practice could better be contained therein, except for the era of the so-called Sifting Time, 1743-1750. A voice from the present century closes the matter:

> His theological position was closer to that of Luther than was Spener's, his emphasis being on simple, heartfelt trust in God through Christ rather than on conscious conversion or ardent endeavor after personal holiness. He continued, however, the initial impulse of Pietism in so far as it was a protest against high and dry orthodoxy and a seeking after heart religion.[1]

---

1. C. H. Lowry, Jr., "Zinzendorf," *Encyclopedia of Religion*, Vergilius Ferm, editor (New York: Philosophical Library, 1945), p. 840.

CHAPTER III

SPANGENBERG AND THE FIRST MORAVIAN SETTLEMENTS IN AMERICA

August Gottlieb Spangenberg, one of the two scholars who tutored Zinzendorf before his Lutheran ordination, is the next character who needs to be introduced in this study. In a sense he is even more important to the record of colonial Moravianism than the Count, because he was in this country far longer. Moreover, his service to the church continued for a full generation after Zinzendorf's death; and in a very real sense it was his form of religious experience that prevailed among the Moravians.

A man whose personal loyalty to the Count can never be questioned, Spangenberg served the Brethren heroically from the time he joined them in 1733 until his death in 1792. He recognized all his life the debt he owed his spiritual counsellor. But history makes it clear that despite the glorious Moravian revival of 1727 to 1760 (when Zinzendorf died), it was the next generation that was to test the quality of the revival to the utmost. And in this generation Spangenberg was the dominant figure, both in America and on the Continent. Furthermore, it was this same kind and scholarly man who led the first band of Moravian immigrants to Georgia in 1735. He was a true pioneer and a man of many parts, religiously, culturally and economically.

The most complete biography of him[1] is scarcely known to the English-speaking world. If it were known, there would be much warmer appreciation both for his own splendid Christian character and for what he meant to Count Zinzendorf. They were men who needed each other. They complemented each other's nature. Zinzendorf was a dreamer, an initiator of plans, an eagle that soared so high there was scarcely chance for him to get back and put his feet on the ground. Spangenberg was a practical man, gifted with rare insight as to where a procedure, once initiated, would lead, a work horse that could be depended upon to pull his share of the load and at the same time inspire the rest of the

1. Gerhard Reichel, *August Gottlieb Spangenberg, Bischof der Brüderkirche* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, publisher, 1906).

team to pull with him. There is hardly a member of the Moravian constituency in eighteenth century America who was not influenced by him directly or indirectly.

Spangenberg's Pietistic Background: Other Strange Tendencies

Zinzendorf's first lieutenant was born in a Lutheran parsonage at Klettenberg, Hohenstein, on July 15, 1704. His father, George Spangenberg, may have been descended from some famous theologians of the Reformation having the same family name. Georg gave seven years of service to the schools at Halle and then entered the pastorate at Klettenberg at the age of thirty-two. He corresponded with Francke for a number of years, soliciting money to repair the steeple of his church and discussing other matters. In a letter written in 1703, he said that he had not been as successful in his six-year pastorate as he had been in his teaching, chiefly because of internal opposition. When a new Lutheran hymnal was introduced into Hohenstein in 1707, a storm broke out. All hymns with expressions of the old ideas of satisfaction were discarded.[1] One of Spangenberg's few recollections of his father was how courageously he opposed this. The old songs, evangelical and Pietistic, the pastor supported with all his enthusiasm. There is some reason to believe that thereby he saled his death, because of the pressure of persecution and slander heaped on him for his stand. His opponents did not like the Pietistic hymns, and some even went so far as to deny Christ's deity.

Both the father and mother were to Pietistic inclination. They frequently called their four sons into the study for prayer. Father would fall on his knees and commend them to the Lord in many tears.[2] The air of a believing pastor's home was too telling not to influence the children for years to come. Bible instruction was given daily, and father hoped that the boys in some way would all serve the church. It was not too poor a home, apparently, because the parents gave the altar and pulpit

1. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
2. Charles T. Ledderhose, *The Life of Augustus Gottlieb Spangenberg*, (London: William Mallalieu and Company, 1855), p. 1.

for a new little church that was built. But tragedy struck early. After a fifth son was born (and died), the mother passed on, leaving little August, age four, with a clear memory of her long suffering but easy end.

A stepmother came into the picture subsequently, but after the father's death in 1710, she went to Hanover and left the boys to the father's kin. A guardian used up the money intended for their education, but Spangenberg said later that he tried to feel no animosity toward him, seeing that God helped them despite all. To make matters worse, the four boys lost most of what they owned in a fire, while August was in school in Hefield. Yet once more, looking back, he said that this was good training for the inner man.[1] Various traits, among them this almost Stoic determination to bear hardship, appeared quite early in his life. Another tendency was to feel a strong sense of youthful sin.

> I did not appear wicked; on the contrary, I was often commended for my good behaviour. This, however, proved very hurtful to my soul, tempting me to indulge in many sinful practices. I should undoubtedly have committed many more sins, had I known how and when to do it. Our Lord Jesus Christ with much patience bore with me and my wretched condition; in which I continued for a considerable time without restraint. By his gracious care and watchfulness I was kept in ignorance of many sinful things, which otherwise might have proved my ruin. My Saviour guarded me like a tender mother, who follows her child, when it runs to the fire, or is in danger of falling into the water.[2]

In his characteristic humility and with the same Pietistic notion of sin exhibited above, he wrote: "I was a bad child and remember myself then with horror: how I was guilty in my kindergarten years before God and man."[3] But even in his tender years he felt another life stirring in his heart. On his bed at night he meditated: "Lord Jesus, I will live to Thee; Lord Jesus, I will die to Thee."[4] A spiritually susceptible child, he carried with him the religious influences of his parents' home. He was making progress, even though he felt the raise of others harmful.

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 3. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
3. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 9. 4. *Ibid.*

Then there came the time of doubt. He felt influences which he later thought were surely trying to lead him to hell. He abandoned God and put him out of his sight. He felt God let him go, so that he would see what the natural man does and where the adventure of godlessness leads. Though he wanted to try to gain the world, the Saviour would give him no joy in doing so.[1] He came to the point of declaring insolently to God: "Leave the pleasure of the world to me, and I will leave heaven to you."

His awakening, however, came in his fifteenth year. His conscience awoke, and he could no longer do evil without great fear.

> The Holy Ghost made me to abhor my whole course, by placing before me all the sins I had hitherto delighted in, and enabled me to perceive my utter depravity of soul and body. These discoveries made me feel ashamed of myself. I remembered what the Lord had done for me, and how great and merciful had been his goodness, while at the same time, my own ingratitude stared me in the face. I looked upon myself as the vilest sinner, and thought the most wicked transgressor was a better man than myself. This broke my heart, and so completely overwhelmed my spirit, that I could have sunk into the earth with shame and confusion. Then our Saviour, in mercy, showed me that it was an act of his grace which made me mourn, and bitterly lament my sinfulness.[2]

Especially notable in this analysis is the expression, "This broke my heart." This is typical of the Pietistic bent of his life and will come back into the picture later in this study. He described how he went through utter exertion of the will to the point of weariness, and then had to let go. He remembered a whole night, "albeit in my sleep,"[3] praying God to stay by him and help him. But finally he came to peace. Victory was not complete. The struggle would have to go on, rising as courage came, and falling as the life of misery returned. But the issue no longer lay in uncertainty. God would claim his man. The tragedy was that he knew no one to give him good advice and set him straight.

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
2. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
3. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

Life would be different, he thought, when his school days were over. He reached eighteen and time for the university. Jena, the "university of paupers," was natural for him, because his three brothers gained their advanced education there ahead of him.

Struggles at Jena

The key figure to his Jena years was Johann Franz Buddaeus, more positively Pietistic in his university activity than in his writings.[1] It was through a sermon by Dr. Buddaeus on Acts 26:29 that Spangenberg was "converted" and called away from his original intention of studying law to the ministry. This "conversion," in his eighteenth year, was more durable and overwhelming than his earlier experience. He gained a new mind, when the Saviour seized his heart. The sense of God's many mercies caused his heart to melt, and the experience did not rush by quickly. It remained for a long time, and often he could not hold back the tears as he mixed with others or just went walking along on the street. Contrition, not fear, brought his tears. The sense of being forgiven, he says, brought an ecstasy almost like being intoxicated. He found no words to express the joy he felt to be in the Lord's society, poor sinner though he was. He fled his former company; he was now misunderstood by them. He hurried through contacts with people so that he might talk again to his Saviour, so wonderful in his love. His childish view made him think he had to "report" to Jesus.[2] Not all was ecstasy, however, for now he set out in earnest study of Spener's edition of Luther's small catechism. Possibly at Buddaeus' suggestion, he wanted to ascertain whether the catechism was fully in harmony with the Scriptures.

At this time, a mystical-separatist tendency was developing in Pietism in North Germany among the citizens and peasant class. Like Count Zinzendorf, Spangenberg was forced to face these deviations. The surprising fact is that the latter shook off mysticism much more rapidly and more completely than separa-

1. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

tism. But at this point he read many books of a mystical character and associates with persons who admired such works. His own simplicity of faith was thereby spoiled, and his mind stored with many fanciful and unscriptural notions. This matter of simplicity leads us to the heart of Spangenberg's experience. It will deserve careful analysis.

> In one of his essays he thus alludes to the state of his mind at this period: 'I lost the simplicity of Christ, separated myself from all connection with the Church of God, and withdrew from the table of the Lord. By so doing I gained nothing either for myself or others, but was rather the more tempted to sin. Nothing could have been more painful than this chastisement. I, therefore, now cried unceasingly to our Lord Jesus Christ for his hercy, which at no time was entirely withdrawn; nor was my confidence put to shame.'[1]

For several years, then, it appears that he associated primarily with "pious folk" who tended in the direction of mysticism, separatism and absence from Holy Communion. Spangenberg's absence from the sacrament was based on conscientious motives. He felt that thousands were attending with no serious purpose. They were making mockery of the Lord's table, because neither had they been converted nor had they any apparent intention to turn from their evil ways. Meanwhile, no one seemed to be impressing upon them the hypocrisy of their ways. Actually, he admitted later that he himself by absence from Communion fell into hypocrisy and self-complacency. This was followed, as is so often true with mystics, by a bitter disenchantment. His sins began again to rage frightfully within him, leading him to a sense of acute failure and utter misery. The result was a complete withdrawal from the outside world. He temporarily cut off ties even with his brothers, who tried to dissuade him from his course.[2]

But his solitude did not liberate him. He was prey next to Gichtelism. The central tenet of this group (called by some, angel-brethren) was celibacy. In place of marriage for the

---

1. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
2. Reichel, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 28.

reborn, one was to come into heavenly wedlock with Wisdom. Though Gichtel had died in 1710, Johann Otto Glusing must have come through Jena around 1725 and made a powerful impression on Spangenberg. He got such a firm hold on the youth that he fell into a new darkness, finding no going out or coming in. Actually, it will be seen that his confusion concerning marriage stretched into the future at least fifteen years, through his time in Pennsylvania with the Schwenkfelder. The Gichtelian contact put him in so dark a room that it was as though he could not see as far as the next step of his foot. Thus his promising "conversion" fell into a labyrinth of darkness in his fifth university year. Withal he maintained his sincerity of purpose, but he had lost what was infinitely precious to him, simplicity.

Several events helped to turn the tide, at least temporarily. In 1727 the gloomy Glusing died. Around the same time, Spangenberg got his first information about the Brethren in Herrnhut. And by now his friendship with Dr. Buddaeus was more than casual. He was living in the Buddaeus household, enjoying a rare intimacy with the learned man and becoming his amanuensis. The doctor's method with students was tempered and kindly. He advocated a sensible, modified piety, by which he hoped his younger friends would acquire a healthy, evangelical viewpoint, avoiding all by-paths and questionable practices. He said: "All holiness must flow entirely from Christ, from His power and wounds. . . .In the Lord I have righteousness and strength."[1] Reichel finds him a truth-loving, middle of the road man between Pietism and orthodoxy.

His growing deafness made Buddaeus feel Spangenberg was more and more indispensable to him. From amanuensis he became more of a co-worker, so that in 1723 he indexed Buddaeus' *Dogmatics*. As mediator between students and professor, he also learned some business methods that should prove valuable to him later on. He came to think of Dr. Buddaeus as his "*Lieben Papa*," going on a last journey with him to Gotha in 1729. There he enouraged the stricken professor with prayer, Scripture and hymns, even watching with him through the

1. *Ibid.*, p. 18.

night. He went back to Jena for Buddaeus' physician, at the risk of his life. Finally, he was alone with the doctor when his life came to a placid end. Thus, there died for Spangenberg a second father.

Scholar and Servant of Christ

It has been noted above that Jena was known as the "university of paupers." Life there was rough, which, if added to the sad childhood of Spangenberg, helps to explain some of the irregular tendencies in his personality at this time. According to Reichel, student dissoluteness at Jena outran other universities.[1] Repeated edicts against unchastity were given. There was abuse of townspeople, brawling and duelling, endless breaking out of student libertinism. Societies made up of students from the same home town or province were the hardest to cope with. They were frequently suppressed by military force. All of this was enough to drive any young Pietist to solitude and separatism.

His decision to study for the ministry served only to heighten the problem. Anyone, he realized, who would study theology and be Jesus' servant must be willing to face suffering and hardship for the sake of his name and word. However, the challenge to excel in scholarship laid its claim of attention and energy upon him, so that other influences offered less chance of distracting him. He set out to cultivate a better Latin style, did some writing at the instigation of Buddaeus and his older brother, and came into friendship with some of the university lecturers on the Greek fathers. All of this broadened him and helped to bring him out of his shell. He decided to remain at Jena in order to become Master of Arts. This gave him not only further learned work, but permitted him access also to younger students. He dedicated his new title, "Master," to the Saviour. He would be a scholar of Christ. He would use his title humbly, among his lowliest brethren.

He was very conscientious in his classwork and grew steadily more popular with students. He lectured with applause to an

1. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

average of forty hearers.[1] Outside the classroom he organized an "ascetic college," in which biblical edification was given to any who wanted to come. Growth of this group was rapid. Soon more than a hundred met to hear the crucified Christ preached with firmness and agressiveness. The gentle professor gave a more strenuous call to those who would come to meet informally. In addition to this "college," Spangenberg was active among three groups of poor Jena students who lived in the suburbs. These gave him an immediate challenge, in view of missionary stirrings that were repeatedly agitating within him. He felt a great compassion for the poor heathen who did not know Christ. In 1728, aroused by Winckler, he felt drawn to Negro work and resolved to go to Africa, if God opened the way.

Discovering the divine will was always a matter of serious moment to Spangenberg. In 1735, after he had joined the Moravians and took as his assignment a trip to America to help the Schwenkfelder who formerly lived at Herrnhut, he questioned the advisability of founding colonies in the new world. He felt it meant mixing business affairs with propagating the gospel. But as for launching missionary work among the Indians, he said he would like to try it "with both hands."[2] He never wanted to be found in a situation where he could not feel God had placed him. Therefore, in November, 1737, when Zinzendorf urged him to return to Europe, he wrote to the Count: "Give me a command *from the Lord*."[3] But since that was not forthcoming, he stayed in Pennsylvania for two more years.

As for his service in the suburbs of Jena, he did an intensive piece of work with some thirty-six students and catechized about a hundred and eighty children from the orphanages. Unfortunately, a bad moral situation in one of the families of the "awakened" group developed, which ultimately demanded investigation by the Saxon authorities. Soul-satisfying though this home missionary work was to him, it was also hard on him, with roughnecks heckling him and professors trying to dissauade him from it. The "poor" students were known to be bad risks, and it was

1. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 112. 3. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

not long before the missionary-professor had 150 Reichsthaler out on precarious loans. But he was not looking for an easy place. In 1730-1731 he was offered two other opportunities, one to join the faculty at Halle, the other to become, upon Zinzendorf's recommendation, court preacher at Copenhagen. He declined, feeling that both offers would make life too comfortable for him.

> The true God, who has not forsaken me in this hour, but has given me bread to eat and water to drink and clothes to wear, the same will take me further in his service and will not deny me what every miller gives his donkey and every farmer gives his ox, namely fodder; but with it work and beatings.[1]

Firsts Contacts with Herrnhut

When Andreas Beyer and Gottlieb Wriedt came from Herrnhut to Jena in October, 1727, they brought the first direct news of the Moravian revival to Spangenberg. Fortunately for him, one of them lodged with him and told him in great simplicity what the Lord had done for his soul. Spangenberg called him the angel of God. Around the same time he read of the struggle of the Brethren when they came to Saxony from Upper Lusatia. He was so impressed that, he says, "I fell first on my knees, then on my face, and cried unto God with many tears to convert my soul, *break my heart*, and form me into his own image by revealing his hold child Jesus to me."[2] It may well be that he also read a book about Comenius and church discipline, edited some years before by Buddaeus and published at Halle in 1702.

At the end of 1727 or early in 1728 Zinzendorf himself came to Jena and founded a group of "awakened souls." At this time the two "greats" of Moraviandom shook hands for the first time. Zinzendorf preached on the text: "Be ye followers of God as dear children, and walk in love." The impression made was profound, not only upon Spangenberg, but upon many other students. Communication between Jena and Herrnhut continued, and ultimately a hundred students from seven different national

1. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
2. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

groups gathered in devotional fellowship and rented a house as a meeting "depot." In this way, Spangenberg came to know quite a few Herrnhuter before visiting their inspired center in April, 1730. Gradually there emerged two desires from these contacts: one, to join the Brethren, which he did in 1733, the second, to proclaim Christ to others. For the time being, the work in the suburbs of Jena fulfilled his second longing. But he came gradually to feel disposd to give it up, though it was prospering. Some of his key co-workers were lost, and even after Zinzendorf sent two cooks from Herrnhut to provide a more nutritious table for the poor, the strain was beginning to threaten both Spangenberg's bodily and spiritual welfare. He longed for some service where he might be in closer fellowship with persons of like mind and soul. He looked enthusiastically toward Herrnhut:

> Brotherly union among them is intimate, cordial, childlike, and as sincere as can be wised, while, at the same time, its only object is the attainment of a thorough self-knowledge Outward ordinances are instituted for the edification of the church, and are altered according to circumstances. As regards external prosperity, the congregation is in very distressing circumstances, and exceeding poor; for most of the members have sacrificed all their earthly possessions for the sake of saving their souls, and inhabit a place where they can earn but little. Yet they are contented; I have never heard a single complaint, although many have but very scanty means of subsistence and are very sickly. They have to suffer much from their neighbours around them, and often are greatly perplexed by their enmity. But the Lord helps them, and has made them to increase more and more within the last ten years, amidst all opposition.[1]

It was in the year 1730 that Zinzendorf's and Spangenberg's friendship began to grow strong. Their letters henceforth were brotherly, without stiffness of form. They used the intimate "Du" in speaking to each other, possibly, Reichel thinks, because Zinzendorf, a nobleman from head to foot, suspected some nobility in his new friend's family.[2] However, the time was not yet ripe for full association of effort on their part. A noble ex-

1. *Ibid.*, p. 21, quoting a letter written on October 7, 1732.
2. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

periment was made in Halle, with Spangenberg destined to be the victim of its failure.

It was observed in Chapter II that, from his Wittenberg days on, Zinzendorf was concerned about divisions within the church, especially as they affected the Pietists. By 1730 he himself was in the bad graces of the Pietists, and Herrnhut was disapproved. Then, when Halle invited Spangenberg to its faculty, a solution seemed possible. Disagreeing parties would be drawn together by his distinctive service. Had he not the combination of intellect, piety, and geniality that would fit him exactly for this work of reconciliation? Instead of the strain between Herrnhut and Halle (and the threat of open break), why could not these children of God be melted into one?

Spangenberg himself could not understand why there should be difficulty for Lutherans to have friendship with believers from Bohemia and Moravia. He objected to the policy of excluding all who did not hold to the orthodox Lutheran line. He believed that a faith that is active in love is essential. Those should be excluded who do not have faith. Why should not one be able to overlook the faults in others if love covers a multitude of sins?[1]

The death of Professor Breithaupt created the vacancy on the Halle faculty which Spangenberg was to fill. After sending a "feeler" that did not draw too eager a response, Francke wrote a very complimentary and urgent letter on March 22, 1732, asking Spangenberg to help at the orphanage as well as to teach, saying that there he could use all his God-given gifts but would have to suffer, if need be. The latter struck a responsive chord rather than any promise of large salary or outward reward. Like a child without understanding, he awaited a revelation of God's will. The shortage of hands at Halle made him inclined to feel it was a divine call. The opportunity to heal the break between Herrnhut and Halle was very attractive. But the matter should be decided by the lot. This said yes, so to Halle he went, arriving on Michelmas, 1732.

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 63.

Tragedy at Halle

Within three weeks of his arrival, it became clear that he was expected to cut off all ties with Herrnhut. He refused, proposing rather that there should be conferences held to adjust any differences that existed. These were rejected, for Halle being now in the second generation of its life, tended to cling to the past without wanting any change. Nothing from days gone by should be lost.[1] This carefully grooved system from the past was Spangenberg's stumbling block. Once he was in the wheels of Halle he had only three choices: give in and let his back be broken, let the wheels bring him around with a powerful jerk, or be thrown out of them entirely. Abbot Steinmetz, of Halle, observing all developments, hoped the old love and former unity in the Spirit could again come to Halle through the "beloved Brother."[2] He felt doors were opening, but with many adversaries.

Meanwhile, Spangenberg and Zinzendorf were in regular correspondence. Usually this was quite congenial, although already in late 1731 and early 1732, there was a break between them. In spite of the fact that the Count asked him in December, 1731, to become his adjunct in God's affairs, he seems to have accused Spangenberg of personal pride in winning certain converts. He felt all glory should be given to God, thus giving offense by his hidden reproaches. Had Spangenberg accepted the position of adjunct and not gone to Halle, he would have been spared one of the bitterest experiences of his life. Correspondence with Zinzendorf in October, 1732, shows that he wanted to win souls to the Saviour, but not to thrust his sickle into strange fields. He was free to do almost as he wished in Halle at that time, but by November 12 he said he could do little. When the Count visited him on November 20, he was doubtful about the whole Halle cause.

Part of the trouble, Reichel thinks, came from there being too few clear-cut principles at Halle. Effort was made to call black

1. *Ibid.*, p. 69. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 70.

white, and white black. Two and two were to equal five. Again, Spangenberg's preaching stressed law and morality, as though he felt them lacking. He said little about justification, feeling that was stressed enough by others. Another difficulty was his unwillingness to accept high titles. He tended to withdraw from certain students and to associate with tailors and with other common people.[1] More seriously, he thought much of the humility of Halle was unreal and affected. And he continued to express doubts about giving absolution and communion to the unconverted and unbelieving. He did not want to attend communion himself with the "godless," but whereas he could absent himself at Jena, he had to be present at Halle, feeling hypocritical about it all the time.

In December, 1732, things reached a climax. He began to join in nightly prayers with a group of townspeople who had had a "club" for three or four years previously. At first the authorities approved this effort, but gradually they became hostile. On the second Christmas evening a group of tailors, entertaining him, held a love feast, as he had seen it in Herrnhut. The meeting lasted five hours and was given to studying God's Word and to prayer. At the end of the meal, Christmas cakes and wine were passed, with which all those present drank to each other, making a wish or saying a verse of Scripture. The next day it was said in town that Spangenberg had had communion with the Glauchan commoners, even though he had spoken that evening of the difference between love feast and the sacrament. His previously known thoughts on communion were held against him, naturally.

On New Year's Day he was summoned to a conference with Francke, Baumgarten and Mischke and, after a three-hour debate, was dismissed. He was told that as a private person, he was entitled to his opinion about separation from communion, but not as a teacher. He must conform to the practice of the Church. A "graceful" dismissal was asked of the King for Spangenberg, and on Maundy Thursday, April 2, the actual

1. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

court order arrived. He gathered a large flock of students and other people for a parting word on Good Friday evening. On Saturday he left by way of Jena and Ebersdorf for Herrnhut, arriving on May 9. Undoubtedly some of the opposition against him was really being directed toward Zinzendorf. The complete break between Halle and Herrnhut had taken place.

His Early Work among the Brethren

Becoming assistant to Zinzendorf, then, in the summer of 1733, Spangenberg was saved from turning into a strict separatist. Not actually approving of separatism, he was surely leaning toward it. He felt a greater affinity with world-fleeing separatists than he did with churchly Lutherans.[1] Since Halle was not a suitable base for his operations and principles, would Herrnhut prove to be? The answer is clearly yes. He would not have gone there if he had not found it congenial. Zinzendorf had made it clear that no one should come if he were not like-minded and willing to unburden his heart.

It should be remembered that the time of Spangenberg's arrival was one of unrest at Herrnhut. Instead of finding peace, he was caught in a veritable whirlpool. Both Zinzendorf's person and position were threatened. His banishment from Saxony was imminent. He was in the process of deeding his property to his wife, and arrangements were being made for the removal of the fugitive Schwenkfelder on his estate, since the enquiry commission banned them. The Count needed a man to go to Denmark on a secret mission, and Spangenberg was his man. Part of the mission was to get permission for someone to be consecrated a bishop of the Unity. If need be, Zinzendorf himself was to have the office conferred on him. Spangenberg tried for almost two months to work things out in Denmark, but failed and got little thanks for his pains. He also failed, soon afterward, to gain a Württemberg prelature at Stuttgart for Zinzendorf, a measure intended to improve the Count's status before both church and state.

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

The next assignment turned over to his assistant by the Count was that of doctrinal formation. He was of great help, because of his academic experience, in molding the course of events in the critical year, 1734. A prize acquisition of the Brethren, he arrived just in time, putting into suitable form the doctrine of the Lamb of God, which takes away the sin of the world. The doctrine of the cross took the central position as Spangenberg wrote.[1] He held to the orthodox view of justification and felt that the Lutherans expressed all major doctrines better than others: e.g., the Reformed or Roman Catholics. Free grace seemed to him to express best his own religious experience. The operation of God's grace was for him the motive of all ascetic demand. And this leads to the great essential: to follow Christ and to meet his demands of sacrifice. He did not have much interest in dogmatic discussion when he found kindred spirits with an austerity of life like his. That was the binding tie, not dogma.[2]

Beginnings in America

There lived in Spangenberg an enterprise-loving soul, ready for all sorts of activity. Consequently, when it became inperative for the Brethren to look across the ocean for a more permanent haven than any are of Europe seemed able to provide, he was the man chosen to make investigation. Actually, for a whole generation now, his work was to be mainly in America. A first thought concerning the Schwenkfelder was that they be sent to St. Croix. Another possibility was Georgia; but while negotiations were under way in Copenhagen in their behalf, the Schwenkfelder decided to go to Pennsylvania at their own expense. Spangenberg was then commissioned to lead a group of Moravians to Georgia to establish a colony.

It was on the voyage to Georgia that the Wesleys had their memorable contact with Spangenberg. Fisher gives his account as follows:

---

1. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
2. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

> In 1735 John Wesley, accompanied by his brother Charles, went out as a missionary to Georgia. A number of Moravians were on board, and among them one of their noted preachers, Spangenberg, afterwards a bishop. Wesley—whose ascetic tendency led him to take on himself unnecessary discomforts on the voyage—was struck with the serenity of these men in the midst of a raging tempest, when the rest of the passengers were agitated with fear. On landing, he consulted Spangenberg concerning the religious work which he was to undertake in conclusion with Oglethorpe's colony. 'My brother,' said the Moravian pastor, 'I must ask you one or two questions. Have you the witness within yourself? Does the spirit of God bear witness with your spirit that you are a child of God?'
>
> On the voyage home (after two years) Wesley was once more afflicted on discovering that he was not free from the fear of death. In England he sought out a society of Moravians, Peter Böhler among them, seeking spiritual aid. It came through hearing an anthem in St. Paul's Cathedral and on May 24, 1738 in a meeting of a Moravian society (Aldersgate), listening to the reading of Luther's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. 'The words of Luther on a free salvation awakened within him a new feeling—a joyous assurance that his sins were all forgiven. He looked upon himself as having been up to this time in the dark on the subject of justification. He connected himself with the Moravians, and made a visit of several weeks' duration at Herrnhut.[1]

It was the Aldersgate experience that is generally known as the time when Wesley had his second conversion and felt his heart strangely warmed. In all Protestant history there is probably not a better example than this of the role which *feeling* plays in religious experience.

The end of the story of Wesley and the Moravians, however, is not so congenial. He was much impressed by Herrnhut but possibly resented not being included in the sacrament of Holy Communion.[2] His chief accusation was that the Moravians blindly followed Luther, and this he regarded as the source of their fundamental errors. Also, he was "a little repelled by the lordly ways of Count Zinzendorf, their pious patron."[3] Consequently he later withdrew from the Fetter Lane company of Moravians in England, embarassed by their quietistic tendencies.

---

1. George P. Fisher, *History of the Christian Church* (New York: Scribner's, 1916), p. 516.
2. Adelaide L. Fries, *The Moravians in Georgia*, p. 193.
3. John McNeill, *Makers of Christianity* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1935), p. 247.

There were nine Moravians in the party that went to Georgia besides Spangenberg, and they reached Savannah on April 17, 1735. Their grant of land was five hundred acres on the Ogeechee for the colony as a whole, with Spangenberg holding title to an extra fifty acres in what is now the city of Savannah itself. A cabin was built on their leader's land, fields were cleared and planted, and the prospects for the first crop were very good. The genius of the party, who was thus getting invaluable experience for later colonizing, also served as cook. There was nothing to which he was unwilling to set his hand. But when warm weather came, sickness broke out, and the work was especially hindered by the fact that one of their number who best understood farming was ill. Spangenberg one day knelt by his bedside, and having offered a fervent prayer turned to the man and said: "My brother, get up from this bed, and consider yourself well." The man actually was able to rise and go to his work again.[1]

The only books he had taken with him to America were his Bible and an English dictionary—strange limitation for a man who had achieved the rank of Master of Arts! But in the colonial undertaking he was able to live out his tendency toward asceticism and perhaps chose to combine with that the simplest expression of his faith. Hardship was demanded by the nature of the situation, but he was always in front of his brethren in this area. In Georgia he was not only leader, agent and cook, but cashier, preacher and pastor as well. He strongly advocated attention to diet, believing that numerous instances of death on St. Croix (where another Moravian colony was established in 1731) could be traced to dietary disregard. He made use, so far as he could, of native herbs.[2]

A second company of colonists, led by Bishop David Nitschmann, arrived at Savannah in February, 1736. This group saw the fruits of splendid organizational ability on Spangenberg's part. He had found just the right location along the river for houses, timber for boats, land for grazing, for mulberry bushes and for the cultivation of silkworms. Vegetable gardens had

1. J. Taylor Hamilton, *A History of the Moravian Church*, p. 79.
2. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

been laid out, and a plan for the whole settlement was drawn up. His sober judgment took in all the factors: water supply, altitude, and accessibility. The future master colonizer had done his work well. He had gotten the Moravians absolved from military service, secured for them British civil rights, and now urged the Count to get action in England recognizing the Moravian faith.

Since George Böhnisch, who had been sent to Pennsylvania with the Schwenkfelder, was to be transferred, Spangenberg now headed north to look into the affairs of the former brethren at Herrnhut and to become their pastor. He had served the Georgia colony just about a year and was ordained a presbyter by Bishop Nitschmann (who now took charge of Georgia) in recognition of his satisfactory service. He was received in Skippack, Pennsylvania, with a hearty greeting from his old friend, Christopher Wiegner, leader of the Schwenkfelder. He turned farmer and even split rails in behalf of these brethren living in a common economy. He entered fully into their life, wearing their gray buttonless and pocketless coat and drawing as did they his food and clothing from the common store, while relinquishing all other claims for the common good. It was a purely voluntary matter, and one could come and go as he wished. He tried to draw them out of some of their exclusiveness, but they stiffened and became even more exclusive than before. When he left them to go back to Europe, he had finished his preparation for further colonial leadership.

The utter divisiveness of the many groups in Pennsylvania disturbed him considerably. Accompanied by Wiegner in 1737 he went to Oley to visit German Lutherans and Reformed from Württemberg and the Palatinate. He preached there and also at Tulpehocken, mingling with Mennonites and Tunkers, so that when Peter Böhler came to Pennsylvania in 1740, he found that Spangenberg was well known everywhere. He felt the Lutherans and Reformed, as in Europe, were still taking in unworthy members and giving communion to the wicked, with it all neglecting piety. He found the strongest kinship, and at the same time the

greatest opposition among separatists.[1] He became acrid about congregations which think they are righteous because they have a scholar for preacher and a church for worship. In America, he said, the people cry out because they have no preacher, giving that as their excuse for immorality. In Germany, at least, they make a pretense of righteousness, saying that they follow their preacher's word not to steal, drink and swear. He grew quite cynical about churchliness.

Spangenberg was in Europe for nearly five years, beginning with late autumn of 1739. It was the time of his first marriage, of his being elevated to the office of bishop, of being in charge of the schools at Herrnhaag and Marienborn in Wetteravia. "His activity rendered his services highly valuable, and they were so often called into requisition that he became, according to his own confession, 'the common servant.' "[2] Part of this time found him holding special responsibilities while Zinzendorf was in America. But before any of this is detailed, it will be good to have a look at the life and religious experience of Peter Böhler, who followed Spangenberg to Pennsylvania in 1740.

Peter Böhler

Here was a man of great gifts and fervent piety. He is rated as "next to Spangenberg, the most important man in the early history of the American Moravian Church."[3] Like Spangenberg he became a leading bishop of the Church, was scarcely less closely identified with its work in America during the first two decades and, as theologian, preacher, evangelist, and administrator ranks near him in its history.[4] He was born on December 31, 1712, in Frankfurt-on-the-Main, and, showing great ability even in his early years, was sent to Jena for a theological education. Reichel thinks it was only the "awakened" student group

1. *Ibid.*, p. 105
2. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 43
3. Levin T. Reichel, *The Early History of the Church of the United Brethren*, (Nazareth, Pa.: Moravian Historical Society, 1888),p. 73.
4. J. Mortimer Levering, *A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania*, 1741-1892, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Co., 1903), p. 39.

with connections with Herrnhut that kept him from being led astray by worldly students at Jena from his home town.[1]

It was a sermon by Spangenberg at one of these meetings that sealed his future. "I heard and remembered only that one sentence," he says: " 'The Saviour has the power to liberate from sin.' This went to my heart, and the Saviour soon proved to me practically that He is able to free us from the power and dominion of sin."[2] Before leaving Jena he became leader of the "awakened" group after Spangenberg, learned to know Bishop John Nitschmann quite well, and helped to direct the studies of Christian Renatus von Zinzendorf, the Count's son, when he came to Jena. The Count urged Böhler to stay at Jena long enough to earn his advanced degree, *Magister Legens* (equivalent today to Master of Arts or perhaps Doctor of Philosophy). Thus the Moravian church was to be enriched by the service of another well-trained university man. It was this solid academic background, which Böhler and Spangenberg shared, along with their excellent gifts of practical wisdom and unending common sense, that helped to bring the Church out of its flight to fanaticism from 1743 to 1750.

After his period of Jena service, lecturing on the Hebrew language, Böhler was ordained by Count Zinzendorf. His marriage was performed subsequently by Spangenberg, and eventually he was made a bishop of the Church. His first assignment for the Brethren was to visit students at Oxford. This paved the way for the entry of the Moravians into Britain. It also brought about his introduction to John Wesley on February 7, 1738. The need for fervid and cheerful piety and for the realization of personal assurance, characteristic of the Brethren's theology and life, was as great in England at that time as on the Continent.

> The cold intellectualism of Tillotson, paramount in the best circles, was having its legitimate effect in repressing religious spontaneity. The swing of the pendulum from the fanaticism typical of England in the middle of the seventeenth century to the reckless license of the Restoration had begun to incline toward external adherence to

1. L. T. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 73. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 74.

> accredited dogmas in combination with a disrelish for vital goodness. The wretchedness of the masses was as lamentable as their ignorant superstition. Drunkeness and debauchery were too common not to be palliated. Profanity was the vice of both sexes and all classes. Gross brutality entailed slight reproach. Numbers regarded highway robbery as the trade of a gentleman. The courts of justice suffered notoriously from bribery. Charities were openly perverted or despoiled. The prisons for criminals and for debtors had not yet felt the efforts of a Howard. . . .Thus it had continued until towards the end of the year 1729, when several students at Oxford—John Wesley, a graduate, Charles, his brother, George Whitefield, Benjamin Ingham, John Gambold, and others, about a dozen in all—covenanted to live piously. . .[1]

Meetings between Böhler and John Wesley occurred frequently during the three months before the former sailed for America. "Mr. Wesley appears to have derived more evangelical light from Peter Böhler than from any other man with whom he had been acquainted up to this period."[2]

> Here are two ardent young men, scholarly, deeply in earnest. The one has lately returned from his attempt at mission work, conscious of failure, and conscious that deep down he lacks something, the possession of which would have averted failure. He is burning with ardor to serve his Lord and his own generation, a very knight errant of the gospel, yet not himself in the light as to fundamentals. The other is nine years the junior of his new English acquaintance, and has been ordained a few weeks since, with a commission to cross to the western world. His cheerful, open countenance invites confidence. There is a poise of calm and peace which the senior lacks, for all his advantage of years and experience. As zealous as he is of doing with his might what he finds to do, Böhler is more free from anxiety respecting the leading of the Lord. Whilst they converse together through the medium of Latin, it is natural that their similarity and dissimilarity should mutually attract.[3]

It was during an illness of Charles Wesley in these months that Böhler was able to touch his soul. The Moravian brother acted as nurse and was privileged to lead Charles into the light. Several quotations from John Wesley's *Journal* are pertinent:

---

1. J. T. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church*, pp. 85, 86.
2. L. T. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 75, quoting from the *Wesleyan Cententary*, p. 55.
3. J. T. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church*, pp. 86, 87.

Saturday, March 4.—I found my brother at Oxford, recovering from pleurisy, and with him Peter Böhler, by whom (in the hand of God) I was on Sunday, the 5th, clearly convinced of unbelief, of the want of faith whereby alone we are saved. Immediately, it struck my mind: 'Leave off preaching. How can you preach to others, who have not faith yourself?' I asked Böhler whether he thought I should or not? He answered: 'By no means.' I asked, 'But what can I preach?' He said, 'Preach faith till you have it; and then *because* you have it, you will preach faith.'

. . . . . .

Thursday, May 4.—Peter Böhler left London in order to embark for Carolina. O what a work hath God begun since his coming to England! Such an one as shall never come to an end till heaven and earth pass away.[1]

One specific outgrowth of Böhler's work was the Fetter Lane Society, set up at the home of James Hutton. Rules for the society were drawn up by Wesley and Böhler, just before the latter went to America. The future found him in America for fifteen years, in four visits, and in England for perhaps seven. As bishop of the Unity he governed the British work in 1750, an outgrowth of the Fetter Lane Society, and at that time gave his blessing to John Cennick, the flaming evangelist who cast his lot with the Moravians and did heroic work both in England and Ireland. He was back in England intermittently, visiting on financial matters in 1764 and promoting better relations between the Moravians and Methodists in 1772-1773. His death occurred in London on April 27, 1775.

His first work in America was to preach to Negro slaves in Purysburg, South Carolina, while supervising the colony in Savannah. During this period of service he had as his apprentice helper young David Zeisberger, whose glorious work among the American Indians will be examined in Chapter VII. The work with slaves came to a sudden ending when the Savannah colony was abandoned. Securing passage for the remaining colonists on a boat to Philadelphia with George Whitefield, Böhler transferred Moravian efforts north to Pennsylvania. While waiting for Bishop Nitschmann, he supervised the first part of a building

1. L. T. Reichel, *op. cit.*, pp. 75, 76.

operation in Nazareth, Pennsylvania, for Whitefield, but was suddenly asked to withdraw his Moravian carpenters from the scene when Whitefield grew angry and engaged in a heated argument with Böhler on the subject of predestination. The Moravians held consistently to the doctrine of free grace, but their opponents in both Philadelphia and New York, thus represented by Whitefield, were strongly Calvinistic. While, in the end, respect for the Moravians in America grew, Böhler and others of their preachers were much abused, especially in the larger cities, with such epithets as "papists." The fall-out with Whitefield is especially unfortunate, since the latter is reputed as saying that Peter Böhler was his spiritual father.[1]

Böhler's further influence on the American Moravian settlements will be considered below. After his recall to Europe early in 1741, the Pennsylvania Moravians, cast off by Whitefield and now led by Bishop David Nitschmann, purchased a tract of five hundred acres along the Lehigh River, at the mouth of the Monocacy Creek. This was the site Zinzendorf was soon to name, *Bethlehem*. A few months later, Whitefield fell into serious financial difficulties and so was happy to sell the Barony of Nazareth, including the two buildings the Moravians had built, to the Brethren. This opened up the possibility for large-scale colonization in Pennsylvania and convinced Zinzendorf that he should make a personal visit to America to observe the new settlements and to investigate other matters then on his mind.

---

1. F. F. Hagen, *Old Landmarks* (Bethlehem, Pa.: private publication, 1886), p. 59, footnote 7.

CHAPTER IV

ZINZENDORF IN AMERICA (1741-1743), AND LATER

It was entirely in keeping with his adventurous spirit, temperament and idealism that Zinzendorf should have come to America. When he arrived in New York late in November, 1741, it was the second time he was found on this side of the Atlantic. He had visited the Moravian mission on the island of St. Thomas in the West Indies in 1739. From Spangenberg and Böhler he gained much advance information about America, but was evidently not fully prepared for what he found in Pennsylvania. Of this stage of its church development, it was said that Pennsylvania was

> a complete Babel. The serene founder of our commonwealth could never have dreamed of such a result from his provision for freedom of conscience. It is indeed astounding that a community, guaranteed liberty in this respect, should have been overwhelmed by the spirit of bigotry. Fanaticism, proselytism, confusion and schism were abroad in the land. An ominous cloud hung over the Church of Christ. . . .But suddenly, in 1741, a bolt out of the over-arching gloom descended upon our Reformed Church, threatening it with disruption and destruction.[1]

The bolt referred to was the arrival of the Count.

Whether the bolt was all of negative import, as Dotterer indicates, or not, the decade of Pennsylvania history into which Zinzendorf's stay fits was a time of religious awakening, excitement and enthusiasm. The awakening is unparalleled in the history of the commonwealth.

> Within this period is embraced the establishment of the monastic feature of the Ephrata Community; the advent of the Moravian Brethren; the thorough organization of the German Dunker Church; the visit of Whitefield and its attendant excitement; the bitter feud and schism among the Presbyterians; the advent of Mühlenberg and his efforts to firmly establish the Lutheran Church in this country; the coming of the regular clergy of the Reformed faith;

---

1. Henry S. Dotterer, *Rev. John Philip Boehm*, (Philadelphia: no publisher's name given, 1890), p. 7.

> and the numerous revivals in the Baptist Church; together with the decline of the Society of Friends, both politically and religiously; all of which falls within this short period of time.[1]

One outcome of Spangenberg's activity from 1736 to 1739 was the formation of an association to amend the religious conditions of the Germans in the colony. It was known as "The Associated Brethren of the Skippack," and to it belonged men of various creeds. It was clearly the forerunner of the Pennsylvania Synods, shortly to be described. Its monthly meetings pointed up two large needs in Pennsylvania: (1) Missionary work among the Indians; and (2) preaching the gospel to the nominal but unchurched adherents of a half-forgotten faith and to the thousands who were utterly ignorant. Alongside the need for church work was the need for schools, since educational facilities were virtually non-existent among the colonists of interior America.

"Zinzendorf himself was stirred with a noble ambition, namely, to effect an evangelical alliance of German Protestants in Pennsylvania, irrespective of creed."[2] He went so far as to resign his powers as a bishop of the Moravian Church temporarily, so that he might not hamper this effort by the charge of denominationalism. Furthermore, so that his rank might not be obtruded or prove a hindrance, he chose to be known in America as Louis von Thurnstein, though his disguise was transparent. In an address at Herrendyk, Holland, in August, 1741 he stated his purpose in going to America:

> I have been destined by God to preach the word of the blood and death of Jesus, not with over-refinement, but with the power of God, without regard to what will happen to me. This has been my mission before I knew the Brethren. I am and shall indeed remain connected with the Brethren, who have taken up in their heart our Gospel of Jesus Christ and have called me and other brethren to the service of the Congregation, but I shall not thereby separate myself from the Lutheran Church, for a witness of Christ can live and stay in this religion.[3]

---

1. Sachse, *op. cit.*, I, 457.
2. J. T. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church*, p. 105.
3. William J. Hinke, *Life and Letters of the Rev. John Philip Boehm* (Philadelphia: Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church in America, 1961, p. 90.

Philadelphia: the First Pennsylvania Synod

The Count arrived in Philadelphia on December 10, 1741. He made the acquaintance of Henry Antes, one of the "Associated Brethren" and a member of the Reformed Church, and on the 15th of the same month Antes sent out a call for a conference she following New Year's Day that proved to be the first of the to-called Pennsylvania Synods. Antes called it

> in order to treat peaceably concerning the most important articles of faith, in order to ascertain how closely we can approach each other in fundamental points, and in other matters that do not subvert the ground of salvation, to bear with one another in charity, that thus all judging and condemning among the above mentioned souls might be abated and prevented.[1]

Antes was well liked and well known in the colony, so there was a large attendance at the first meeting, held in the home of Theobalt Endt of Germantown. Those present included Conrad Weiser, representing the Lutheran faith, "the only German justice within the Province, and who but a short time before, as Brother Enoch, was one of the most influential members of the Ephrata Community,"[2] a mystical settlement of Sabbatarians. Then there were Antes and others of the Reformed Church, Mennonites, Dunkers, Sabbatarians (or Seventh Day Dunkers), Schwenkfelders, Separatists, Mystics, and two Moravians (besides Zinzendorf)—about a hundred in all.

The prevailing restlessness in Pennsylvania religious circles got the meetings off to a good start, Antes presiding. The avowed purpose was not to supercede existing religious societies, but to form a superior organization of sincere followers of Jesus. They were to cultivate the higher graces of the Christian life, guide by their pious influence the bodies they represented, and maintain a godly fellowship, leaving the congregations to attend to minor and temporal affairs as before.[3] All of this has a Zinzendorfian ring to it. Even though the time was not ripe for this sort of union, it was a grand scheme.

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
2. Sachse, *op. cit.*, p. 444.
3. Dotterer, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

Meanwhile, the Count paid a visit to the new settlement of Moravians on the Lehigh River fifty-five miles north of Philadelphia, and on Christmas Eve gave the town its name, Bethlehem. On his return to Philadelphia for the first "Synod," he was in touch with the Lutherans of the city. He found that they had been without a pastor for several years, had sent a request to Germany for one, but had been put off because they were unable to pledge a definite and adequate salary. The warden (*Vorsteher*) of the congregation in his official capacity requested Zinzendorf to fill their pulpit on the Sundays designated. Worship was held jointly with the Reformed people, and the Reformed pastor, Boehm, registered no objection.[1] The Lutheran ritual was used, and a first service of Holy Communion was celebrated on Easter Day, the Count officiating, assisted by Christopher Pyrlaeus, formerly student of theology in Leipzig. Ritter says that this arrangement continued for about nine months.[2] By July, however, disagreement broke out among the Lutherans, probably over Zinzendorf and some of his ideas, and when Pyrlaeus came to preach one Sunday, he found the church locked. Forced entrance was made by the pro-Zinzendorf party, and Pyrlaeus proceeded to hold the service. When a member of the opposite party arrived and ordered preacher and people to leave, "there was a great tumult in the church; the people trod upon each other, women screamed, and a crowd of spectators gathered. The lock-breakers were arrested. Count Zinzendorf, upon hearing of this affair, hurried back from Tulpehocken,"[3] where he was looking into the possibility of missionary work among the Indians.

Upon his arrival in Philadelphia, the Count demanded apologies from those who had caused the trouble, but he made no further effort to serve the Lutheran parish. Thirty-four persons who chose to support him became members of the Moravian church established on Arch Street as a separate congregation.

---

1. J. T. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church*, p. 107.
2. Abraham Ritter, *History of the Moravian Church in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Hayes and Zell, 1857), p. 19.
3. Dotterer, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

As for the Lutherans, unity was finally established among them with the arrival in November of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. The latter had previously been superintendent of the orphanage in Hennersdorf, Saxony, maintained by Henrietta von Gersdorf, Zinzendorf's estranged aunt. He was of the Halle school, currently opposed to the Count, so that the long-standing quarrel in Germany was reflected in the Philadelphia affair.

Zinzendorf was frequently misunderstood, though his motives may have been of the best. Wallace reports that at the first Pennsylvania Synod,

> A delegate from Ephrata remarked to Weiser that the Count had a big sack into which he intended to stick all the sects and separatists so that he could reign unchallenged. This remark Weiser took amiss at the time; but afterwards, having quarrelled in the meantime with the Count, he said that the later conferences showed the Brother from Ephrata to have been right.[1]

Sachse is more kindly disposed and feels that "Zinzendorf's object in calling this conference was not with the view of uniting all denominations with the Moravian church, as has been repeatedly stated. As a matter of fact, there was none in America at that time."[2] The actual organization of the Bethlehem congregation did not come until June, after the synods were over, and the effort at union had failed.

Trying hard to be Mr. von Thurnstein in America, the Count doubtless failed at the game in part because of his haughty spirit. Immediately after the first Synod, on Epiphany Day, he was in Skippack preaching. A number of Schwenkfelders were present to greet their former patron, but when he insisted that they cooperate with him in the synods, they refused. "He claimed to be the divinely appointed reformer of the Schwenkfelders, who had a right to their loyalty and co-operation. This they denied emphatically and refused to have henceforth anything more to do with him."[3]

---

1. Paul A. W. Wallace, *Conrad Weiser* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945), p. 120.
2. Sachse, *op. cit.*, p. 442.
3. Hinke, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

Before passing on to the accomplishments of the later synods, it would be valuable to note how the first assembly was concluded, for the spirit of the following reflects so much of Zinzendorf. The prose translation by Neisser is roughly literal; the poetry is extremely rough.

> And now, thou Crucified Lamb, here thou hast us. They hitherto have curs'd us, but do thou bless. We seek no one's silver or gold or apparell but the poor Souls for Thee; Thou hast been offered for them, hast purchas'd them all by thy Blood. We serve thee some of us, these 30 years, for thy Holy Crosses sake; our Tabernacles wherein we reach thee are upheld by thy hand, some above two hundred some above 700 years under their first Name; & thou hast their memory still in Honour. It is no strange thing that thy Church, which Thou hast founded is still standing; we dwell in it. Thou seest that the Spirits of the Monks of Tunis, of Arius and Donatus are still living tho' his Name has been varied several times, being afraid of the Rock of thy Faithfulness, Godhead, Truth be dash'd in pieces.
>
> My God, Thou seest them flying,
> And thee denying.
> Thro' Satans Envious Lying,
> And to thy throne;
> Remember Jesus dying,
> He is the Lamb:
> O Can one without crying,
> His Joy deny him,
> Were not the Heathens by him
> Bought on the Stem.[1]

The Subsequent Synods

The success of the first assembly of the "Congregation of God in the Spirit" led to the prompt calling of the second synod, January 14 and 15, at the residence of George Huebner at Falkner Swamp. The minutes record the election of Zinzendorf as presiding officer, or "Syndicus." The representation was narrower than at the first meeting. From Germantown none

1. *An Authentic Relation of the Occasion, Continuance and Conclusion of the First Assembly*, etc. (The Seven Pennsylvania Synods), tr. by George Neisser (no place given and no date, but c. 1742), pp. 145, 146.

was present except John Bechtel. Most of the sect people[1] had withdrawn, the conferences evidently not meeting with their favor. But a few Dunkers and some delegates from the Ephrata cloisters were on hand. This was the last appearance of the Ephrata people. The representatives of the Dunkers were warned that if they continued their associations with these meetings, they would no longer be recognized by their brethren as part with them.[2]

One of the decisions of the conference, probably expressing better the convictions of Zinzendorf than of most of the other attendants, was:

> The proper object of this assembly of all evangelical denominations is, that henceforth a poor inquirer for the way of life may not be directed in twelve different ways, but only in one, let him ask whom he will. But if any one should take a fancy to him who directed him in the way, and should wish to travel on the same according to his method, he has full liberty to do, provided he be as yet in no connection with any religious society.[3]

The third synod met February 10-12 at Oley, at the house of John de Turk. After it was over, an undenominational congregation was organized in the community, with Spangenberg's successor, Andrew Eschenbach, as pastor. Subsequently David Nitschmann ordained him as a Moravian minister. Three other Brethren were ordained at the synod: Christian Henry Rauch, a missionary to Indians near Esopus, New York, Gottlob Buettner, destined to be a missionary among the Six Nations; and John Christopher Pyrlaeus. Rauch also baptized three Mohican Indians "into the wounds of Jesus."[4] In spite of the apparently strong Moravian influence at this synod, Hamilton insists that very few of the Moravians were present until the seventh session,

---

1. Besides the groups mentioned above, Sachse speaks of Free Thinkers, Independents, Hermits, Inspired, New Lights, Old and New Dunkers, Socinians, Arians, Baptists, Arminians, three varieties of Reformed (German, Dutch and Scotch), three varieties of Lutherans (German, English and Swedish) and *Vereinigte Vlaaminger en Waterlander*. Spangenberg added still another class, those who cared for neither God nor His word and were commonly called in slur by the name of *the Pennsylvania religion*.
2. Hinke, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
3. *Ibid.* 4. *Ibid.*

in June.[1] The movement was more completely organized now. Three trustees were elected, namely, Andrew Frey, a Dunker, Gottfried Haberecht and Anthony Seiffert, both apparently Moravians from Bethlehem. They were instructed further to elect two worthy men to superintend the Congregation of God in the Spirit. It was to be their duty to prevent, as far as lay in their power, this union from being dissolved.[2]

This last remark admits that the handwriting was seen on the wall. When the fourth synod, meeting March 10 to 12, had representation from only the Lutherans, Reformed and Moravians, Zinzendorf suggested dissolving, but other members voted him down. He defined his relationship to the Lutheran and Reformed churches and admitted that he hoped for full union in time. It is in connection with this subject that Sachse says:

> Several efforts were subsequently made by Zinzendorf to induce the secular brethren of the Ephrata Community to leave the fold of the Sabbatarians and unite with the Moravians; but the scheme was always foiled by the influence of Beissel (the leader at Ephrata), or the actions of his deputies who attended the conference.[3]

The last three synods with which Zinzendorf was connected were held early in April, May and June, respectively, all in Germantown. Concerning the April meeting, the minutes say: "Pennsylvania is a complete Bable. The first to be accomplished is to liberate its prisoners, which cannot be done according to common rules: apostolic powers are required."[4] One wonders what this could have meant. A catechism was written and read for the Reformed congregations, but not accepted as authentic, because apparently Zinzendorf was the chief hand. The criticism given is that

> The catechism is full of practical Christianity and fervent in spirit, but it lacks method, and it can hardly be called a Reformed catechism, because, as Boehm remarks: 'There is in it from beginning to

1. J. T. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church*, p. 106.
2. Hinke, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
3. Sachse, *op. cit.*, p. 456.
4. Hinke, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

end not a word of the articles of our Christian faith.' The Sacraments are not central, nor the Commandments, nor the Lord's Prayer.[1]

At the time of the sixth synod interest had dwindled noticeably, and Henry Antes is reported to have declared that he regretted ever having left the Reformed constituency. He insisted that he still rightfully belonged to it.[2] On May 28 a group of fifty-six new Moravian settlers arrived in Philadelphia, enroute to Bethlehem, and stayed for the last assembly. With sixty-four other Moravians already in Bethlehem, they asked to be received into connection with the Congregation of God in the Spirit. Thereby the control of the synods passed entirely into the hands of the Moravians. The noble experiment was doomed. It had begun auspiciously, but as one denomination after another withdrew, the Moravians were left virtually alone at the end.

As to why the synods failed, Wallace believes the Count's haughtiness was as responsible as anything. But then, "The demon of denominationalism, the pride of superior piety, was about to make all split. . . . In an effort to hold the crumbling edifice of church union together, an intricate device was concocted, based on the use of the lot (to which Zinzendorf was much addicted)."[3] This practice will be discussed shortly in connection with his other work in America. The device, with its dependence on the lot and its air of unnecessary mystery, was a contradiction of the very thing that had drawn many earnest Christians into the Moravian camp, their solid common sense.

One might say that the Count was two hundred years ahead of his time with this ecumenical effort. Perhaps the objective was too high for the place and the time. It would seem that the province was not ready for church union. "The religious swamp had to be drained first into sectarian channels before its waters could be drawn into the sea of the Church Universal."[4] Those who know both Zinzendorf and Spangenberg might agree that

1. *Ibid.*, p. 97. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 98.
3. Wallace, *op. cit.*, p. 120.
4. *Ibid.*

had the latter been in America at the time, things might have gone differently. He was less flighty and haughty than the Count, a practical man who was able to fit his thinking into the pioneer American spirit better than Zinzendorf. It was his earlier fellowship with such key men as Antes and Weiser that made possible the first successful synod. But the Count, having more vision than tact, was not equal to the task of guiding the new ship of union so recently put to sea. Though Pennsylvania and most of America would have to wait many a day for further progress toward denominational co-operation, the names of Zinzendorf and his associates must be placed early in the record of American ecumenical efforts.

Other Activities in America

If the Pennsylvania Synods as well as Zinzendorf's work with the Lutherans in Philadelphia are to be counted as a failure, what success did he have during his fourteen months in the United States? Hamilton says: "Though Zinzendorf's effort at a union of denominations in Pennsylvania failed, he was directly and indirectly instrumental in establishing the Moravian Church in America in a manner which he had not previously designed."[1] Moreover, in the latter half of 1742 he made three tours of the Indian country of Pennsylvania, thus making himself acquainted at first hand with prospects in this field of evangelization which had so much appeal to the Moravians. A late July journey took him beyond the Blue Mountains, where few white men travelled. On this tour he had an interview with deputies of the Six Nations at the home of Conrad Weiser, interpreter for the government. The second journey was to the area where Christian Henry Rauch was working in New York state. Ten converts, three of whom had been baptized at the Pennsylvania Synod at Oley, justified the Count's organizing the Shekomeko congregation there. The third journey, in fall, took him to the Sunbury area and the Wyoming Valley, where it is thought that his party was the first among white people to see this gem of Pennsylvania scenery.[2] Conrad Weiser rescued him from a near fatal attack by the Indians enroute.

1. J. T. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church*, p. 109.
2. *Ibid.*

This is an appropriate time to describe Zinzendorf's use of the Lot, for Weiser makes some interesting observations about it in a letter. Wherever he went, it seems, the Count carried his Lot apparatus with him in his pocket. It was a little green book, with detachable leaves. Each leaf contained some motto or text. And when the Count was in a difficulty, not being sure of the Lord's leading, he pulled out one of these leaves at random. He consulted it on all sorts of topics and regarded it as the infallible voice of God. "To me," said he, in a letter to Spangenberg, "the Lot and the Will of God are simply one and the same thing. I am not wise enough to seek God's will by my own mental efforts. I would rather trust an innocent piece of paper than my own feelings."[1]

This struck Weiser as hiding behind the Saviour. But, he says in a letter recorded by Wallace, "as I had gone along as his guide, I did not want to oppose him"[2] (when they were discussing how they would travel and what route should be taken). Weiser argued with the Count later, however, because the Indians at Shamokin expected a visit from them on their way home. Weiser writes, "I protested on several grounds and said, I would not let myself be governed by lot, especially in Matters in which common Sense could decide." Said Zinzendorf:

> 'Do you contradict the Savior again, and will you follow your own blind Reason and Caprice? I and my brethren will do, what the Savior says, and that is our Plan.' said the Count in a rage. I retorted, 'I knew no such Savior as told men to lie.' 'What! Do you call the Savior a liar?' *Answer*: *Yes*, if he told you not to go to the Truth itself. You promised the Indians at Shomockin, on your Return to tell them the purpose of your Coming and so forth. If you do not keep your promise, what will the Indians say? Will they not take you for a Liar and Suspect the whole Business, and be offended with you, and so put Obstacles in the Way of the Missionaries. Do what you will. I serve the Government of Pennsylvania as an ambassador to the Indians; up to now I have kept a good Name among them, and will not become a Liar now, but will rather go home alone by way of Shomockin and keep my word. But I shall

1. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 274.
2. Wallace, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

> report your Imprudence and Bad Temper to Brother Spangenberg, so he may know who has spoiled the Game.' . . .'Well I must have been mistaken, responded the Count, so we will ask the Savior again, who is right, you or I,' and he handed me 2 Lots—little bits of paper, which I without thinking, took and turned up: There was a *Yes* on one, and a *No* on the other. 'Now' said the Count, 'draw. The Question is, whether we are to go back by way of Shomockin: and if you draw the *yes*, we shall.' So then I handed the *No* back to him and kept the *Yes*, without thinking; and he took it without noticing anything amiss: for our Heads were full of Rats Nests. He told me to read mine and it said *Yes*: The rest of the Party, who were looking on, saw everything and smiled, but they kept still.[1]

As a result, they went back to Bethlehem the way Weiser advised and had an interview with Kachhawatchiky, the chief of the Shawnee Indians.

Amusing as this incident is, it would be unfair to judge all use of the lot thereby. By and large, it served as a tremendous impulse to stronger faith. It was rarely used unless all parties involved agreed to accept its verdicts in faith. And so stimulating did it prove to the life of the church that it survived in a limited fashion for a century after the time of Zinzendorf.

He dedicated the completed new Moravian church building in Philadelphia on New Year's Day, 1743, and eight days later set sail from New York for Europe, where other business was calling him. It had been a profitable fourteen months for the Pilgrim. He had been an inspiration to dozens of people, and he himself had learned much. His eccentric ways cost him the understanding of many persons in the New World and proved him to be less fitted for that environment than his dependable associate, Spangenberg. But wherever the man went, the stamp of his religious experience was left indelibly. Goerner shows how educational institutions in America felt the combined influence of the Count and Francke.[2] Congregations had been formed for the Brethren in Bethlehem and Philadelphia, also the unique Indian congregation at Shekomeko. At Oley an

1. *Ibid.*, p. 143.
2. Walter J. Goerner, "Die Bedeutung August Hermann Franckes für das Erziehungswesen," an unpublished thesis submitted at Frankenhain Thüringen, 1942. Copy available in the Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pa.

interdenominational church was formed, a kind of forerunner to the American community church. And though the Pennsylvania Synods were not successful at the time, who can say that the experience derived from the effort is not a valuable portion of ecumenical history?

The Elements of Heart Religion

It will not serve the purpose of this study to pursue details of Zinzendorf's personal career or travels any further, since it is the American scene that is of primary interest. Suffice it to say that he continued to travel up and down Europe, to the British Isles and to the borders of Scandinavia and Russia. In October, 1747, his banishment from Saxony was lifted. Previously, at the Synod of Hirschberg, he had gained unlimited powers of management and oversight of the Moravians, as *Advocatus et Ordinarius Fratrum*,[1] which powers were soon to cause him more grief than satisfaction in his management of affairs in Wetteravia.

It should be pointed out here that the events that had been unfolding under the Count's leadership were part of a world-wide awakening. "It began with the Pietist movement in Germany in the seventeenth century and at first was most marked in Lutheranism."[2] What happened in Herrnhut was a notable chapter in the progression. Related were the Great Awakening in the Thirteen Colonies and the Evangelical Awakening in Great Britain, under Wesley and Whitefield. The revival affected the Church of Scotland and eventually the Reformed Churches on the Continent, along with the dissenting Methodists, Congregationalists and Baptists.

In the face of all of this, what was the distinctively Moravian contribution, and how was it fostered by Zinzendorf? A major A major part of the answer must be given in terms of his religion of the heart (*Herzensreligion*). The one idea which controlled Zinzendorf's life was the thought which obtained possession of him in early boyhood, which he expressed by the word, *Herzens-*

1. J. T. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church*, p. 114.
2. Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), p. 1018.

religion, 'Heart religion.' "[1] Unquestionably this heart religion developed as part of his protest against rationalism. His impression of the religious conditions of his age was predominantly negative. The enlightenment he considered to be the Continental result of British deism.[2] The new learning had introduced into Germany a movement which taught a religion based on reason and morals, neglecting historic Christianity in the New Testament sense. He distinguished between *Verstand* (understanding) and *Vernunft* (reason).

> *Verstand* is the *bons sens* which God gave to all human beings with which to judge all essential questions. Whatever is read, learned, ably handled and explained with the understanding, is called *sophia*, wisdom. A philosopher is a man who makes proper use of his understanding. . . . *Vernunft* is, according to my view, the utilization of understanding only to create difficult problems. One hundred are solved, then fifty new ones are added.[3]

It is a religion of the heart, as opposed to a religion of the mind, that is to be supreme. "Our Saviour," continued Zinzendorf, "has declared that the small, the children, believe in Him (Matt. 18:6): From which we can well see that faith has its seat not in speculation, not in thought, but in the heart; it is a light in the heart."[4]

It is possible to take a statement like the latter to the extremes of its implication: namely, that religion is all emotion and no thought. Hök does this and decides: "Religion must be a matter which lets itself be attained without all ideas, through pure feeling."[5] But this is a dubious deduction. "It could not have been Zinzendorf's intention to take an antagonistic position as to the philosophical *Aufklärung*. Contrariwise, he seeks a reasonable association with them so that the *Aufklärung* might be enriched by a correct insight into the essence of religion."[6] Per-

---

1. Josef Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 516.
2. Gapp, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
3. *Otto Herpel, ed., Zinzendorf über Glauben und Leben* (Berlin: 1925, publisher not given), p. 16, quoted by Pinson, *op. cit.*
4. *Ibid.*, p. 34. 5. Hök, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
6. Gapp, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

haps the matter may be clarified by referring to several addresses given in America. The difficulty with worshipping God primarily from the rational approach is that it keeps him at a distance from the believer:

> There is but one Sin, which cannot be forgiven whoever persists in that, must be lost. He who only has Prejudices in his Head against our Saviour, *speaks a Word against the Son of Man*, and may be *forgiven*, Matt. xii. But he whose very Heart is averse to the Cross of Jesus, and likes to have a God who sits upon the Throne of Nature and Reason, (whom one may admire philosophically in his Works, and yet keep at a good Distance from him; and in respect of any real Faith, be pretty sceptical) but cannot relish that God, who may be seen and handled, who is able to bless the Soul and cleanse it from Sin, and partook of our Flesh and Blood on purpose that we might be Partakers of Him: Such a one is a Candidate for the Sin against the Holy Ghost.[1]

And, yet believing and faith are matters of the head as well as of the heart.

> Many religious People are afraid, we make the Way to Heaven too broad and easy, because we insist only on Believing. But let them look at us, whether we are such Men, who turn Grace into Wantonness, etc. If not, they should learn to understand us, why we make so much of Faith. *Rom.* iv, 24. In the mean while let them know, that Faith is the greatest and holiest Work, which a Man can do in this World, if he was to live a hundred Years: No hoary Ascetic can exceed it.
>
> I have always observ'd with awful Pleasure, that the Word for *Faith* in the original Language of the New Testament, comprehends both *Believing* and *Fidelity;* (which latter is in some Sense synonymous with Holiness.) There is a mutual Confidence and Credit between us and our Saviour. As He has shed his Blood for our sake; and if we trust in Him, we are not disappointed: So again, from the Moment we believe, He can trust us, and not be disappointed.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Now what Sort of a Creature is a Believer? He is one who accepts a Gift, which in the first place he knows he has noways deserv'd, and in the second, will to all Eternity never be able to requite. It is no light Matter, that a Head and Heart could come to this Resolution.[2]

---

1. J. Gambold, ed., *Maxims. Theological Ideas and Sentences, out of the Present Ordinary of the Brethren's Churches* (London: J. Beecroft, 1751), pp. 66, 67.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 35, 36.

If others emphasize the role of the head, in religion, he will see that the heart is not overlooked. Indeed, he will win his point by exaggerating it. One never understands Zinzendorf without noting this characteristic.

> The Heart must burn, *Luk.* xxiv, 32. At the same Seat of Feeling, where we are touch'd and affected by other Occurrences in Life, we must also feel Jesus.
>
> To have a Feeling in the Heart, and to believe, is the same thing. Thus little ones may believe; which accounts for Infant-Baptism.
>
> The Nature of Faith may be exemplified by the Behaviour of *Jacob.* When they told him that *Joseph* was alive, and Lord over all Egypt, *his Heart fainted.* Was it therefore not agreeable to him? O yes! as soon as he knew it for certain, he revived at once: But he coult not yet forget the Ideas of his being torn by a wild Beast ,etc. When a Man only wishes at Bottom, there might be such a Saviour, such Peace, and such Forgiveness; he is on the Way to Faith. Such affectionate Faith is the right one, where the Heart fainted not thro' Disinclination, but because the Favour appear'd too great and inexpressible, and we could not suppose He would be so kind to *us.* Afterwards being comforted in every respect, we get firm Footing; and cry out, 'O what a Lord have I! Let Heaven and Earth go where they will; tho' even my Flesh and my Heart fail, He is the strength of my Heart and my Portion for ever.[1]

The latter is typical of the rapturous endings given to many of the Count's addresses. They remind us of the doxologies of St. Paul, as at the end of Romans 8 and 11. As in the case of Paul, Zinzendorf's religion left room for spontaneity in spiritual experience that is surely desirable. Orthodox Lutheranism at the time was rather much of a cool and calculated affair. Zinzendorf's enthusiasm is like a breath of fresh air on a sultry day. In his enthusiasm he sees nothing very unique, for heart religion comes in every age to some few men whose hearts are seized.[2] Rather its uniqueness must be associated with the elaborate doctrine of the cross, which he develops. Indeed, Eberhard regards the center of his theology as the theology of the cross.[3] It is through the cross that heart religion gains its force.

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 61. 2. Hök, *op. cit.*, p. 106.
3. See Eberhard title in Chapter II.

Furthermore, the religion of the heart is the propelling drive that produces a high ethic.

> Zinzendorf was a keen student of the contemporary moral and religious conditions of his age. And he puts the blame for the low state of both squarely on the *Aufklärung*. 'Christ is very much in eclipse (*verdunkelt*). The nations have the form of the Christian faith but deny the power thereof. You hear nothing but about good works and so we drag ourselves around with a dry and impotent ethics.'[1]

In connection with what has been said about the religion of the heart, it should be noted that early in the following century, Zinzendorf's ideas had their largest fulfillment in Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher. Contributing powerfully to the religious awakening in German Protestantism in the nineteenth century, he had attended a Moravian school in Herrnhut before going to Halle. Of Herrnhut, he wrote in 1802.

> There is no place which has remained so impressed upon my memory all through my spiritual development from my first awakening up to the point I have now reached. Here for the first time there appeared to me the consciousness of the relation of man to a higher world, . . .here there first developed that mystical predisposition that is so essential to me; that which amid all the stress of skepticism saved me and preserved me. At that time it sprouted forth, now it has developed and I might say that after all I have now again become a Moravian, only of a higher order.[2]

The "higher order" in the last phrase probably refers to his acceptance of numerous principles of the Enlightenment. Instead of reacting against both orthodox theology and the rationalism and moralism of the Englightenment, Schleiermacher stressed *Gefühl*, sometimes translated "feeling," but perhaps better paraphrased as "religious experience."[3] With his friends, he argued that what they were rejecting was not really religion, for religion is not primarily a set of dogmas "to be accepted by the

---

1. Gapp, *op. cit.*, p. 10. Inner quotation not identified.
2. W. Dilthey, ed., *Aus Schleiermacher's Leben in Briefen* (Berlin: 1858-1863), I, 308, 309, cited by Pinson, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
3. Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, p. 1121.

reason nor a system of ethics, but arises from *Gefühl* and is based upon it."[1] Thus the philosopher of the later century succeeds in preserving the basic emphasis on heart religion initiated by Zinzendorf, yet holding it in a better balance with thought and maintaining due relationship to the community.

On Guidance and Prayer

The discussion above on the subject of the Lot belongs to this general topic, but there is more to it that associates itself immediately with the religion of the heart and the subject just treated. As far as guidance was concerned, Zinzendorf had three criteria, which Spangenberg says he applied as early as at the time of his marriage. He found the Bible, as did the Pietists, able to furnish him with many clear instructions. Then he applied to Jesus Christ, "the friend of his heart," and besought his gracious direction. Finally, he also conferred with other children of God, who were able to advise him on many subjects.

As far as prayer is concerned, he says:

> The entering into our closets, and shutting the door upon us, and praying to God in secret, is a necessary thing for every child of God: and if this declines in a church, it is an injury which neither meetings, nor classes, nor societies, can repair; and brings with it an estrangement from the person of the Saviour, who ought to be near and present to us every moment, and from whose personal and private communion we ought to suffer nothing to detach us.[2]

In all of this, the note of simplicity stands out. Here was a man of noble birth, in touch with worldly culture in many countries, quite familiar with famous personages in France, England, Denmark and Holland, as well as in his own country. Yet he was humble enough to recognize that where trained theologians understood deep things, he could not, as a simple shepherd in theology. "But what the Saviour gave him to understand, that was to him sweet as honey."[3]

That his religious experience brought him joy and satisfaction can be demonstrated from a number of quotations. In spite of heavy problems weighing upon him after his return to Europe

1. *Ibid.*, p. 1122.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 433. 3. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

from America and facing a tedious assignment in Russia, he writes: "All the way to Riga I swam in peace and joy in the Lord, and walked on the shores of the Baltic with a delighted heart. To spend so many days with the Saviour, without interruption, is a great favour, and almost renders us unfit for any other society."[1] For anyone to have a religious experience and not find assurance is abnormal.

> When People strive and plague themselves a long time, and yet never come to any Assurance or Cheerfulness, I believe some think this will debar such wholly from being saved: But it does not appear so to me. Whoever wants the Saviour, and is truly concern'd for his Help, let him for the rest go to work ever so artfully or ever so stupidly, will attain the end at last.[2]

Likewise, while in America, he spoke of the joy he derived from the Bible: "Could I express to others what the written word is to me, there would be a Happiness open'd for one's whole Lifetime."[3] The spontaneous pleasure, the sheer delight, the sense of peacefulness and well-being——— all of this which marks the Count's religious experience is the hope and aspiration of every generation. A certain timelessness surrounds words like these, and no century wants to feel it is unable to bring them to fulfillment: "A man's happiness depends not upon the place where he resides, but upon the felicity he carries about with him in his heart. . . .That place becomes our home, where the most is to be effected for the Saviour at the time."[4]

The personal influence of Zinzendorf upon the religious experience of colonial American Moravians can now be traced, except for a consideration of what is called the "Sifting Time" in Moravian history. If some summary of the Count's character is necessary, let it be said that few men have renounced more of their earthly possessions for the causes of Christ. His renunciation was so complete that it caused consternation on the part of his relatives and scorn from his friends. When he died, in 1760,

1. Spangenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 216.
2. Gambold, *op. cit.*, p. 27. 3. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
4. Spangenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

he was literally propertyless. All that he had, either he or his wife (in his behalf) spent for the cause of Christ's church. Physically he was rugged, enduring for his forty adult years the rigors of world travel and having "no continuing city." He called his retinue, who moved about with him, his "pilgrim congregation," and such they were, and willingly. His ability to win support for his cause was perfectly amazing. The imitators of his spiritual experience, even his ecstasy, were so many that his admirers were thrilled. Yet he must have been alarmed by them, particularly during the Sifting Time.

When asked to define his exact aim and plan, he had to say that he had none in particular, but aimed to follow his Saviour from year to year, gladly doing what he found incumbent upon him. One object after the other was pursued, some waiting for years until the "open door" appeared. He had a weakness of the eyes which frequently handicapped him, but his nature was seldom to spare himself. He rarely let indispositions of the body hold him back, even after he contracted a fever on St. Thomas during his missionary visit. Addison's estimate is not far wrong: "Zinzendorf was undoubtedly a man of spiritual genius and none can say what, without the Brethren, he might have contributed to the religious life of his age."[1]

1. Addison, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

CHAPTER V

THE 1740'S — HIGH TIDE IN AMERICA, EBB IN EUROPE

Throughout the Zinzendorf era it was the policy of the Moravians to shift leaders frequently. This was due partly to the sudden surging of the Count's new plans, and partly to his desire to keep in close touch with the Church's representatives abroad. Shortly before Zinzendorf left this country for Europe, Peter Böhler returned to assume leadership in the growing colonies. Toward the end of 1744 he, in turn, was replaced by Spangenberg and was sent to England to be in charge of the Brethren's monetary affairs there.

This left the Count without his two sanest assistants and counsellors on the Continent. In their place, other young leaders like John Languth and the Count's son, Christian Renatus, were given greater authority. The Wetteravian settlements, especially the one at Herrnhaag, took on a strange character, and a damaging ferment raged. It started around 1743, just about the time the Pennsylvania congregations started to blossom, and continued until 1750, when the Herrnhaag settlement was dispersed. It was first called *Die Zeit der Gärung* (the time of fermentation), but in perspective has come to be appraised more properly as the "Sifting Time" (*Sichtungszeit*), recalling Christ's words in Luke 22:31: "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." It was a time of extravagance and excess, especially at Herrnhaag, and it reached its tragic climax in 1748 and 1749.

Writers like Sessler,[1] encountering it for the first time, are apt to feature it out of due proportion and leave the impression that all Moravians were extremists. Moravians themselves will tend to soft-pedal it and explain it away. On the basis of the more

1. Jacob John Sessler, *Communal Pietism among Early American Moravians* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933).

recent Continental scholarship, it should be possible to have a look at the time, facing it honestly at its worst, but withal understanding why it happened and discovering certain favorable developments, minor though they may seem in proportion to the tragic aspects.

Hök is not to be ignored when he concludes that Zinzendorf's insipid expressions from 1743 to 1750 are in line with both his earlier and later works. He believes that the leading features of Zinzendorf's views are fixed and uniform, judging by the Berlin addresses and the London sermons. He is suspicious that Zinzendorf's friends shield his peculiarities and speak more of his public utterances than of his private words. He wants to give heavier emphasis to the Count's later writings, so as to show his riper, clarified views. Unfortunately he has not had access to the Zinzendorfiana stored in the Moravian archives at Herrnhut, in occupied Germany.[1] For this reason, his views must be considered as only tentative. At the same time, they constitute a reasonable balance to the conclusions of Bettermann.

The latter resents the fact that, so often, people have thought of the Sifting-Time Zinzendorf as the real man. He is known for the extravagances of that time, is called a derailed (*entgleister*) Pietist, and is classed only as a curiosity. Bettermann insists that an at-one-time-healthy teaching is followed by morbid perversion, but then is readjusted into a final way of teaching.[2] The statements of other great Germans seem to corroborate all of this. Troeltsch says the Count's speeches and songs shock. Concerning the same expressions, Goethe said: "I became inexpresssibly fond of him."[3] The sheer beauty of Zinzendorf's poetic forms produced a favorable effect on Goethe. Ritschl recognized that these expressions of the Sifting Time were typical of the era. Therefore, their insipid character is not regarded as so extraordinary as previously.[4]

As a matter of fact, Zinzendorf and the Brethren were attacked very early. This caused many to come to Herrnhaag to investi-

1. Hök, *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 7. 2. Bettermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-3.
3. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 172.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 174.

gate. Being favorably impressed, hundreds took up the cause of the Brethren, and Herrnhaag grew rapidly. By 1745 there were over fifty in the theological seminary,[1] and by 1747 a capacity of six hundred children filled the schools. Römer reminds us that the inhabitants of Herrnhaag were different from the Herrnhuters. The latter were sober refugees under the strict discipline of the ancient Bohemian Brethren. Herrnhaag included a mixture of Germans, Swiss, Dutch, British and French—many of them belonging to the higher, cultured class of society and now mingled with the strange assortment previously living on the Wetteravian soil. What embellished life came to acceptance at Herrnhaag, contrary to the tradition of the more rigid old Bohemian Brethren.[2]

Some Important Antecedents

Now if Bettermann is correct that these seven years do not show us the real Zinzendorf, what led him into this aberration? Hutton is far more thorough than most historians in tracing out the developments. He says that a major step taken by the Brethren, after stressing religious experience instead of dogma, was the designation of Christ as Chief Elder on September 16, 1741.[3] This was done by Lot when Leonard Dober, the third of the Chief Elders of the Brethren felt constrained to resign after six years in office. He had become supreme authority in spiritual matters, even over Zinzendorf, but felt ill fitted for the task and had no desire to become a Protestant Pope. And so, at last, at a house in Red Lion Street, London, they met

> to thrash out the question. . . .At that Conference the Brethren deliberately resolved to ask Christ to undertake the office which had hitherto been held by Leonard Dober; and to put the matter beyond all doubt, they inscribed on their minutes the resolution: 'That the office of General Elder be abolished, and be transferred to the Saviour.'[4]

Strangely enough, however, this applied only to Europe. In America Bishop Spangenberg was still Chief Elder, and Christ was not recognized here as Chief Elder until 1748.

---

1. Römer, *op. cit.*, p. 129.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 130. 3. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 266.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 267.

To Ritschl, the promulgation of the doctrine of the Chief Elder, along with the Brethren's sense of being in a special covenantal relationship with Christ savoured of both blasphemy and pride. He thought the Moravians were trying to put themselves on a pedestal above all other Churches.[1] The fact of the matter seems to be that Spangenberg wrote the Count's biography along these lines instead of stressing the evidence of faith in consulting the Lot, and the wisdom involved in rejecting all human authority in spiritual matters. The Church was now free in a special sense, and for this reason, November 13, when the doctrine was officially announced, became appropriately a day of joyful celebration and continues as such.

The next important step was taken during the Count's stay in America. With him in banishment, there was uncertainty about the Brethren's legal status, so Frederick the Great was appealed to for a concession" allowing them to settle in Prussia and Silesia. Taking the attitude of a practical business man, he readily agreed. As long as the Brethren obeyed the law and fostered trade, they could worship as they pleased. "He granted them perfect liberty of conscience; he allowed them to ordain their own ministers; he informed them that they would not be subject to the Lutheran consistory; and thus, though not in so many words, he practically recognized the Brethren as a free and independent Church (December 25, 1742).[2]

One would think that the whole procedure would have eased the Count's mind. The fact of the matter is that, when he returned from America and heard of things, he was furious. He thought the concessions smacked of simony. None of the arrangements were his, but seemed aimed at fattening the soil, rather than promoting adherence to the Augsburg Confession. Hutton attributes Zinzendorf's rage to lack of ballast in his character. Why not recognize it for what it was, jealousy, prompted by pride? The frustrations of his American tour and the recognition that the German Church fared rather well in his

1. *Ibid.*, p. 267. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 269.

absence threw him into a lack of balance which only the humiliation of 1749-1750 restored. For evidence in support of this position, one need mention only his assuming the office of Ordinary of the Church. This was totally counter to the spirit of the doctrine of Chief Elder. It made him a dictator in name as well as in fact. The wonder of it all is the good grace in which his associates accepted the turn of events. His influence over people and his ability to inspire loyalty at any price are perfectly amazing!

Further aberrations set in. He organized a new society, the "Order of the Little Fools," (Närrchen), based on a corrupted translation of *nepioi* in Matt. 11:25. He told the Brethren that the more like babes they became, the more clearly they would understand the mysteries of grace. "They were not to use their own brains; they were to wish that they had no brains; they were to be like children in arms; and thus they would overcome all their doubts and banish all their cares. The result was disastrous."[1] It was the Sifting Time. Now feeling led onto paths of insensate folly.

The chief sinner was the Count himself. Having thrown his common sense overboard, he gave free rein to his fancy, certainly in a way incomparable before or after, with the evidence at hand. He gave an exposition of the Trinity which offends the rules of good taste.

> He compared the Holy Trinity to a family. The father, said he, was God; the mother was the Holy Ghost; their son was Jesus; and the Church of Christ, the Son's fair bride, was born in the Saviour's Side-wound, was betrothed to Christ on the Cross, was married to Christ in the Holy Communion, and was thus the daughter-in-law of the Father and Holy Ghost.[2]

While burning papers one day in 1743, he noticed that certain lines fell to the ground untouched. Written on them was the couplet, "Oh, let us in Thy nail-prints see Our pardon and election free." He regarded this as a direct message from God.

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 274. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 275.

He altered his style of preaching thenceforward, and said: "The atoning sacrifice of Jesus became our only testimony and our one means of salvation."[1]

Centrality of the Person of Christ

The personal and immediate consciousness of the presence of Jesus, which Spangenberg found wanting in John Wesley during their trip across the Atlantic in 1735, was the most characteristic aspect of the religion of Zinzendorf. It was an extremely "personal, almost amorous attitude toward Jesus."[2] From childhood his whole nature had been permeated by an almost fanatical "devotion to the person of Jesus which supplied him with a mainspring of thought and action."[3] Bishop John Gambold says in a pamphlet that the Count kept one point only before him, namely "the meritorious Sufferings of our Creator."[4] He felt that this was the one point on which alone Christians are distinguished from Deists.

As compared to the awesome and sometimes remote God of straight-line Lutheranism, the Pietists emphasized the nearness and accessibility of Christ. No group carried the latter emphasis farther than the Moravians; to them Jesus was always near, a part of their life, and their leader. Now this Christocentric quality of personal religion, Addison feels, is the true prophetic-evangelical type of piety characteristic of German Protestantism. It has "its instinct for homely colloquy with God, for the preaching of the Word, for simple converse and spiritual exercises in company with like-minded souls, above all, for its warm and cheerful devotion to Jesus the Lord and Saviour."[5]

Ever, in his conscious thinking, the Count dwelt on the Saviour and his merits. During a visit to Jena, it is reported that he prayed with an assembled company on his knees. The hymn, *Salve, crux beata, salve*! was joyfully sung, and on their requesting him to give them an address, he considered the words of the hymn, *Jesu, clemens, pie Deus*!, which produced a powerful

1. *Ibid.*,p. 276. 2. Pinson, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
3. Addison, *op. cit.*, p. 18 (following Wauer, p. 64).
4. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
5. Addison, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

effect on their hearts.[1] At Kirchheim, on another occasion, he was requested to give an exhortation, to which he consented, but stated to the meeting that he was not then in the habit of expounding Scriptures, so would speak to them from his own experience. He then treated of the reasons why he loved the Saviour.[2]

This much emphasis on Christ's person brings little offense to most Christians. But in the Sifting Time, it took on a narrower and more fanatical character. It was not just Christ or his cross that Zinzendorf featured, it was his wounds, particularly the side wound, and all the congregation seemed to hear for seven years was wounds, wounds, wounds!

Sessler has dealt with this subject from its worst and most offensive angles.[3] That it was scandalous and all but destroyed the attractive elements of Moravianism there can be no doubt. Here is a brand of enthusiasm that bordered on unadulterated nonsense. There is no inclination here to defend it. And yet one should try to understand it. The more recent European scholars have succeeded in partial understanding and, probing beneath the surface, discover what it was that the Count and his followers were trying to do, ridiculous as they made themselves.

Hutton believes that his use of the Lot precipitated much of the Count's trouble, for it discouraged the exercise of his mental powers. "As long as Zinzendorf used his own mental powers, he was able to make his 'Blood and Wounds Theology' a power for good; but as soon as he bade good-bye to his intellect he made his doctrine a laughing-stock and a scandal."[4] Instead of concentrating his attention on the moral and spiritual value of the cross, he now began to lay all stress on the mere physical details. This led him to compose the famous "Litany of the Wounds," and the Brethren could now talk and sing of nothing else.

---

1. Spangenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 113, 114.
2. *Ibid.*
3. See Sessler, *op. cit.*, especially pp. 161-175.
4. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

> Still worse, these men now forgot the main moral principle of the Christian religion. Instead of living for others they lived for themselves. Instead of working hard for their living, they were now enjoying themselves at the Count's expense; instead of plain living and high thinking they had high living and low thinking; and instead of spending their money on the poor they spent it now on grand illuminations, transparent pictures, and gorgeous music festivals.[1]

After all, even though the Lamb was slain on Calvary, was he not too the Bridegroom whom his church, the Bride, should meet with joy?

At Herrnhut the ruling principle had been law; at Herrnhaag the ruling principle became liberty. No longer was their religion a discipline. It was a luxury, an orgy, a pastime. At Herrnhut their religion was legal; at Herrnhaag it was supposed to be evangelical. The walls of the Herrnhaag church were daubed with flaming pictures, a unique departure from the simplicity of the Bohemian Brethren.

> In the centre of the ceiling was a picture of the Ascension; in one corner, Mary Magdalene meeting Jesus on the Resurrection morning; in another, our Lord making himself known to the two disciples at Emmaus; in a third Thomas thrusting his hand in the Saviour's side; in a fourth, Peter leaping from a boat to greet the Risen Master on the shores of the Lake of Tiberias. The four walls were equally gorgeous. At one end of the hall was a picture of the Jews' Passover, some Hebrews sprinkling blood on the door-posts, and the destroying angel passing. At the opposite end was a picture of the Last Supper; on another wall Moses lifting up the brazen serpent; on the fourth the Crucifixion.[2]

One can easily see the purpose of these pictures and their appropriateness to the kind of persons who were in an out of Herrnhaag. They were all meant to teach the same great lesson. They were appeals through the eye to the heart. They were sermons in paint. If the Brethren had stopped here, it would have been well. But again, the extravagant spirit of the Count was contagious, and they rode their horse to death. For them pictures and hymns were not enough. At Marienborn Castle

1. *Ibid.* 2. *Ibid.*, pp. 276, 277.

they now held a series of birthday festivals in honor of Count Zinzendorf (at one of which he was not even present), Anna Nitschmann,[1] and other Moravian celebrities. These festivals must have cost thousands of dollars. At such times the old castle gleamed with a thousand lights. "At night, says a visitor, the building seemed on fire. The walls were hung with festoons. The hall was ornamented with boughs. The pillars were decked with lights, spirally disposed, and the seats were covered with fine linen, set off with sightly ribbons."[2]

This was the era (1747-1748) when the hymns of *Anhang XII* to the Brethren's hymnal were introduced. Some of these show the well-intended teaching of the Count on sex. But they innocently gave the public the impression that the Brethren revelled, for its own sake, in coarse and sensual language. All in all, one sees the result of the zeal of plain and humble men getting out of hand. Had Spangenberg, Peter Böhler, or other of the sound influences over Zinzendorf been on hand, probably the whole tragedy would have been avoided. Instead, he yielded to his flighty son, Christian Renatus, and his future son-in-law, John de Watteville.

A One-Sided Figure—Christian Renatus von Zinzendorf

The Count's eccentric son never reached America, but his spirit was represented here by such men as Bishop John Nitschmann and John Frederick Cammerhof. Although several of his hymns are found in modern Moravian hymnals, he is hardly known to English-speaking Moravians, and perhaps it is just as well, since he typifies the very worst of Wetteravianism.

He was the only one of the Count's sons to reach maturity and is regarded as one of the purest representatives of the Brethren's feeling-religion.[3] It is for this reason that his experience is introduced at this point. He serves to show what is apt to happen when his father's ideas are pushed to the extreme. His life was all but untouched by Spangenberg and men of his stripe. He had a one-sided childhood because so many women

1. Respected leader of the single sisters' choir at Herrnhut and second wife of the Count.
2. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 277.
3. Wilhelm Jannasch, "Christian Renatus Graf von Zinzendorf," *Zeitschrift für Brüdergeschichte* (Herrnhut, 1908. II, I), 45.

were around him and because his father was travelling constantly, too busy with church matters to give his son very much of his time. Christel, as he was affectionately called, was a predetermined representative of the Herrnhut religious ideal, born in the year of revival, 1727. He died at age twenty-five, the "martyr of his choir," less than two years after the closing of the Herrnhaag settlement.[1]

Having inherited a weak constitution from his mother, he was sickly as a child, learned to talk slowly, and was doubtless spoiled both by his family and by the hundreds of visitors who came and went among the Zinzendorf household. These visitors were of one uniform type: persons furthering the cause of religion. He seldom played with other boys, but was steadily urged into the role he should fill, namely, that of a religious wonder-child. When he was only nine, his father was banished from Saxony. The boy was suddenly uprooted and exposed for the first time to worldly contacts. The half-fallen mountain castle of Ronneburg gave him a peculiar world among a variegated crowd of middle-class folk and lower.

Christel's tutor was John Nitschmann. He was of the old Moravian stamp, earnest and strict, simple and unlearned, not exactly legalistic in his piety. Generally speaking, his close discipline was good for the boy, but lacking some of the geniality of the Count, Nitschmann was not always too discreet. His tutorship continued into Jena, where the young nobleman was admitted in 1737. Tangles with the authorities set in, because of Zinzendorf's current political troubles, and so Christel was brought back to Wetteravia after two years, devoid of many of the broader influences that had been his father's privilege a generation before. His father was disturbed to learn that there had been no notable religious conversion during the Jena years. Did Nitschmann not understand a child's heart? Every time Zinzendorf talked to the boy, he tried to bring him to a clearer decision, but "it was a fruitless endeavor!"[2] Father and son must find their spiritual congeniality later.

---

1. *Ibid.*, 1909, II, I, 89. 2. *Ibid.*, 1908, II, I, 63.

A gifted child, Christel was not too much interested in intellectual matters. Even after being admitted to the Marienborn theological seminary, he was a trifling scholar. He had an aversion to study and was once severely rebuked for being proud of his position, too light-hearted, and playing with a cat in class! By his middle teens he showed some signs of settling down and was given a trip to Geneva. Here, however, natural beauty, government matters, anything that could serve to broaden his outlook, failed to make any impression on him. He was interested in a one-sided religiosity typical of a "Herrnhuter" of his time.[1]

Back in Marienborn, he took an ever-increasing part in congregational affairs: the singing meetings, student prayer groups, choir meetings and the like. Although his father, when he left for America, was still not satisfied with the boy's inner condition, he gained the confidence of others. He was allowed to attend all sorts of religious meetings, even those of the official conference of the congregation. His first participation in Holy Communion took place on January 3, 1743, after his father's return. At that time he wrote to his mother: "I never cried as much as there; I didn't know where I was."[2] His mystical leanings were on the increase, possibly due to his continual closeness to his mother.

The Count was apparently satisfied now, because he announced on the boy's eighteenth birthday that Christel was to become Joshua, his successor. With John Langguth,[3] he was to be co-elder of the single brethren in Wetteravia. Moreover, he took up and heightened all the Sifting Time tendencies. He advocated devotion to the wounds of Jesus with all enthusiasm. He followed his father's ideas on *Ehereligion* and pushed them lock, stock and barrel to their fanatical extremes. The leader of his single brethren's choir, he became the object of their unmitigated adulation. He was intimately devoted to Chorpfleger Rubusch, a fanatic of Marienborn, to whom Christel gave the affectionate

1. *Ibid.*, 1908, II, I, 68.
2. *Ibid.*, 74.
3. Later to be his brother-in-law, husband of the Countess Benigna.

title, "Herzel." The elaborate festivals were encouraged by the youth; and in the realm of the theological, he said in 1746: "In our congregation things are going bloodier, and the cross and blood matter is more elegant and heart-penetrating."[1]

Of the four young leaders of the Unity in the late 1740's, Anna Nitschmann, Benigna and John de Watteville,[2] and himself, Christel took the center of the stage in 1748, when the de Watteville went to America. He was made a presbyter and was apparently given almost full charge of Herrnhaag, while still leader of the single brethren's choir. On May 21, 1748, he led thirty single brethren into an ecstatic experience in which he stopped his address and said: "Our choir will embrace bodily the little side-hole." While the benediction was pronounced, several fell into ecstasy and could no longer stand up alone.[3] At age twenty-one, all the time insisting to his father that he was not interested in marriage, he addressed a meeting of just the single sisters. He intended no harm and suspected no indiscretion, but naturally dozens became "Christel-worshippers." With six of his most trusted brethren he formed a "society of sweethearts," just one more evidence of the sentimental extremes to which his thought and language of the heart led him. He touched bottom when he introduced the *Ehereligion* to a group of children, speaking in veiled expressions of such things as "conjugal intercourse with the Man."[4]

The pathological involvements of all of this are quite clear. Says Sessler:

> It is not our intention here to make a psychological analysis of this symbolism. Students of psychoanalysis will readily recognize in this extravagant enthusiasm common symbols of common psychopathic fixations. This type of sexual pathology is by no means unique. What makes this particular form especially interesting, however, is the extensive use of theological symbols for sexual themes, and the fact that these abnormal traits dominated the whole community. In the Orient such religious eroticism is common and traditional, and

1. Jannasch, *op. cit.*, III, I, 66.
2. John Langguth was legally adopted by Baron Frederick de Watteville, a life-long friend of Zinzendorf's, and then married Benigna von Zinzendorf.
3. Jannasch, *op. cit.*, III, I, 73.
4. *Ibid.*, III, I, 75.

> Hindu symbolism analogous to Zinzendorf's can be found in the extreme forms of Bhakti and in the Tantric literature; but in the Christian tradition they are comparatively rare.[1]

The worst of this religious eroticism appeared in Christian Renatus. It seems clear that instead of showing a normal interest in the opposite sex by age twenty-one, he sublimated this in an abnormal religiosity. Actually he was too apt an imitator of his father's excesses, while ignoring his more stable qualities.[2]

Two months after the grossly indiscreet address to the children just mentioned, the roof fell in for Christel and his associates. The Count finally seemed to realize the seriousness of what was going on and that solid work at Herrnhaag was being neglected in favor of extravagant and embellished festivals. He summoned his son to London, severely rebuked him and stripped him, temporarily, of all office. Jannasch feels that all the shattering disillusionment that now set in might have been spared him if only he had been granted a different up-bringing.[3] While Herrnhaag was being liquidated, the youth poured out his soul in penitential songs, his pathetic lament. He had been aiming for a higher bliss, steering a more intense course, but largely along lines already charted by his father

He held his last service with his single brethren's choir on August 10, 1750. After that his decline was rapid. He was deeply shaken spiritually, and he was irreparably broken bodily. He stayed close to his father's side, being promised unlimited areas of leadership after the storm blew over. But his inner frustrations slowly destroyed him. His religion, purely subjec-

---

1. Sessler, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

2. Sessler goes into almost a sensational elaboration of these excesses in his book, summarizing his conclusions in the following (pp. 162, 163): "Zinzendorf suffered from a pathological condition in which broke out in demonstrations of emotionalism, phantasies, and morbidity. In place of the pious exhortations of earlier days, his speech now resounded with word pictures of the merits of Christ's blood and wounds and an excess of sensual symbolism. This example of the cultured Count among these simple-minded Brethren was imitated until they used a language which was intelligible neither to themselves nor to others. It was a kind of 'speaking with tongues' in which they strove among themselves for superiority. They called themselves by such diminutive terms as '*Närrchen*' (little fools), 'Herrchen' (little lords), 'Hühnchen' (little chickens), and 'Würmlein' (little worms)."

3. Jannasch, *op. cit.*, III, I, 81.

tive, made him ever more melancholic, as he thought how desperately he had wronged his choir. With John Nitschmann near him once more, he died in London on May 28, 1752, speaking as his last perceptible words: "When my mind grows pale in His arms and bosom, I will still take in what flows from His wounds."[1] Although to most later observers he has been an altogether pathetic figure, he became a sort of unofficial saint among the single brethren, many of whom eventually came to America.

The life just described is a dark page in Moravian history. Facing it frankly, in all of its bitter extremes, one must hasten to say: "Thank goodness this is not typical Moravian experience, even in the eighteenth century!" The Count himself must have been repelled by the sight of his own worst experience mirrored in that of his son. Others who at first revelled in Wetteravianism came to see it for what it was.

Interpreting the Wounds Theology

Now, how is all of this to be explained? Bettermann believes that the blood and wounds theology was not a unique Moravian theology of the cross but basically Lutheran pietism. The peculiar part is that it occured after Zinzendorf turned wholeheartedly to Luther. He wrote a "justification poem" in 1734, when he began taking Luther seriously, and then his drift to the Sifting Time extremes set in. A central point was that the wounds are a symbol of the atonement accomplished. This was in the mind of Augustus Toplady a generation after the Sifting Time, when he wrote:

> Rock of Ages, cleft for me, Let me hide myself in Thee; Let the water and the blood, From thy wounded side which flowed,
> Be of sin the double cure, Save from wrath and make me pure.

"The blood and wounds theology exhibits so little departure from the Lutheranism prevailing in 1734 that the Sifting Time is rather the high point of the defeat of Pietism through Lutheranism."[2] Paul Speratus in the Lutheran Church wrote poetry in this vein, and Erasmus composed the couplet:

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
2. Bettermann, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

But we are thine inherited good,
Redeemed through thine own dear blood.[1]

The root ideas are also in Luther's explanation of the Second Article:

"erlöst,. . .erwoben, gewonnen von allen Sünden, sondern mit seinem heiligen teueren Blute und mit seinem unschuldigen Leiden und Sterben, auf dasz ich sein eigen sei."

And again, in the corresponding place of the larger catechism:

"dasz er für mich genugtäte und bezahlte was ich verschuldet habe, nicht mit Silber noch Gold, sondern mit seinem eigenen teuren Blute."[2]

In the older Lutheran hymns, the message was more about *sin*: in Pietism, this was far outweighed by words about *sins*. The Pietists could never say, as did Paul Gerhardt, in his Easter song: "At sin I can jeer" (*spotten*). The expressions of the blood and wounds theology, therefore, were not invented by Zinzendorf. He found them in existence in the Lutheran music of Scheffler and his associates, and even in pre-Pietistic hymns like those of Paul Gerhardt. This is a rough translation of two Gerhardt hymns:

I embrace with heart and kiss the numerous wounds he suffered,
His feet and nail-marks, and the purple flowing streams.
Thine eyes, thy lips, thy body sorely wounded,
On all I gaze, where we so firmly trust
With heartiness we greet the marks on hand and foot.[3]

Even during the Sifting Time, Zinzendorf believed he belonged to the old Lutheran school of song. On February 5, 1755, he said that the old hymn-book was written in mystical style, the appendix in Lutheran style. In the main part of the Herrnhut hymnal there is little of the blood and wounds theology, and even that is less offensive than Freylinghausen's and other Pietistic hymnals. What excited sensation and opposition was in the last appendix (*Anhang XII*) and four other additions. But in 1755 the Count still insisted that this was Lutheran. He

1. *Ibid.*, p. 56. 2. *Ibid.*
3. Bettermann says: "Aus dem Lied, 'Die Zeit ist nunmehr nah.' "

found it strange that his hymns offended, when he thought they recaptured the old style.

In spite of how convincing the preceding evidence seems, Hök denies it. He says the thought is not ancient Protestant, but of a type of early Catholic spiritualism. He connects Zinzendorf with Luke of Prague,[1] a leading Bohemian Protestant who followed John Hus and his predilection for Christ's blood and wounds. Of all persons alive today, who are familiar with the Count's writings, probably no one knows more than Renkewitz. He says there is absolutely no evidence that Zinzendorf ever read a page of Luke's writings.[2]

Let it be said in summary that Zinzendorf believed religion must be expressed in extreme terms to make it striking.[3] There are those who are either too prosaic or too conservative to appreciate this about his vocabulary. But it was the power of his preaching. A London sermon ran along on the subject of the human will and how the Holy Spirit awakens it. The man awakened by the voice of the Son of God, he said, has responsibility for it, whether he receives the Saviour in faith or casts him off in unbelief. He must give himself up to him and believe. "Give me, my child! Your heart!"[4] There is a fresh directness about this sort of preaching that swayed large audiences. And the rapture of it made them feel they were in the mid-stream of God's grace.

Wetteravia in Retrospect

The rapture of Herrnhaag and Marienborn had run its course by 1749. On Oct. 17, 1749, the Count of Isenburg-Büdingen died. His successor was not impressed by Zinzendorf and at first seems not to have recognized the economic value of the Brethren's being on his soil. He asked them to swear allegiance to the Büdingen government, which they might have been willing to do. But along with this, they were to renounce Zinzendorf, which they flatly refused to do, costly though that proved. Consequently, they were required to leave all their property and possessions, their homes and their lands within three years, which

1. Hök, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
2. Renkewitz, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
3. Hök, *op. cit.*, 0. 105. 4. *Ibid.*, p. 66.

they did. The economic loss was tremendous and took years to rectify. A wave of bitter denunciation of the Count developed, requiring vigorous plemical rebuttal.

> As the Brethren scattered in all directions, the Count saw at last the damage he had done. He had led them on in reckless expense, and now he must rush to their rescue. He addressed them all in a solemn circular letter. He visited the various congregations, and urged them to true repentance. He suppressed the disgraceful 'Twelfth Appendix,' and cut out the offensive passages in his own discourses. He issued treatise after treatise defending the Brethren against the coarse libels of their enemies. And, best of all, and noblest of all, he not only took upon his shoulders the burden of their financial troubles, but confessed like a man that he himself had steered them on the rocks. He summoned his Brethren to a synod. He rose to address the assembly. His eyes were red, his cheeks stained with tears.
>
> 'Ah! my beloved Brethren,' he said, 'I am guilty! I am the cause of all these troubles!'[1]

This sounds like an honest enough statement. One of Hök's complaints is that because they are Brethren, Plitt, Becker, Uttendörfer and Bettermann lack perspective. On the other hand, he says, non-Moravian critics of Zinzendorf who wrote in the eighteenth century (Carpzov, Baumgarten, Walch and Schützen) with but one exception speak out against Zinzendorf, especially because of the Sifting Time.[2]

Obviously the era under question here was disgraceful. It has been labelled in this investigation, "The Ebb Tide of Moravianism." And yet, if inexcusable in general, it can be defended along certain specific lines. Every religious revival, every expression of enthusiasm has its extremes, its aspects for which apology must be made. The Moravian awakening reached its low point from 1743 to 1750. The fact that it experienced a resurgence thereafter proves its vitality and legitimacy.

But even within the seven-year period there were bright spots. The drabness of Pietism was removed. Christianity does not need the glamor of the Marienborn Castle to prove its joyful note, but beside the rigors of Pietism, the Moravians seemed to

1. Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 281, 282.
2. Hök, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

"show a more excellent way." Many of the Herrnhaag residents will be followed in Chapter VI to America. There it will be clear how soon the extravagances were worn off by the rigors of pioneer life. Extremes have a way of being balanced, and these did too. To offset the financial indulgence into which the Brethren fell, years were required to regain solvency. The value of discipline and of an organized system of government were appreciated with new freshness. The Church became more guarded in its language, more Scriptural in its doctrine, and more practical in its preaching.[1]

It was during the Sifting Time, too, that the famous 'Diaspora" work of the Moravians originated. Extending throughout the Baltic provinces, this effort has lasted two hundred years and has consistently given major aid to the cause of foreign missions.[2] One might say that the era likewise stimulated John Cennick, one of the great evangelists of England and Ireland. Cennick visited Herrnhaag in 1746 and 'was amazed by the splendid spirit of devotion shown."[3] He found himself at the hub of the missionary world.

> He saw portraits of missionaries on every hand. He heard a hymn sung in twenty-two different languages. He heard sermons in German, Esthonian, French, Spanish, Swedish, Lettish, Bohemian, Dutch, Hebrew, Danish, and Eskimo. He heard letters read from missionaries in every quarter of the globe.[4]

It was the time when John Soerensen was approached by the Count about serving as a missionary to Greenland. The man agreed to go *the next day* if a cobbler could make him new boots. The boots were made, the man departed, and he remained in Greenland as a missionary for forty-six years!

Finally, the years of sifting removed the Zinzendorf halo. As the quotation above demonstrates, he was deeply humbly and repented. From across the sea a better balanced and practical man was recalled, Augustus Gottlieb Spangenberg. He stayed

---

1. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 281.
2. See John R. Weinlick, "The Moravian Diaspora," an unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1952.
3. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 278.
4. *Ibid.*

to report and advise for something over a year. And after the Count's death, the Church recognized that it was in his capable hands it would find solid leadership.

Heroic Years in Pennsylvania

It was fortunate for the American church that Spangenberg was in control of things here during most of the Sifting Period. Even more than Böhler, he was the ideal leader of the American Moravians for a number of reasons. One was his large-heartedness and geniality. One can see this shine out of his countenance in all the pictures of him that survive. Another was his ability to inspire work among his associates. While he was in charge of the single brethren at Marienborn and Herrnhaag in 1740 and was their schoolmaster, a brother tells this incident: If their captain found the boys asleep beyond the early rising hour, he would call:

> 'Why will ye sleep; award, ye young lions, and be up. Let not sloth bring you reproach.' On one occasion he tapped me on the shoulder, sarying, 'My young brother, when I was at your age, I was always the first out of bed, lit the fire and swept the room. You ought to do so now.' In January, 1740, I generally found him every morning (about 5 o'clock), when I fetched water, standing at the well in the open air, washing his head and hands, though the cold was most intense.'[1]

Reichel believes the years back in Germany between terms of service in America helped Spangenberg. They gave him opportunity to look at the American efforts with critical judgment and careful perspective. Back at the hub of things Moravian, he could sense how he should fit into the larger work of the congregation or denomination. "It must be admitted that during this stay in Germany, he became more bold in his use of terms for the atonement, as did his brethren."[2] Being in the congenial society of the German settlements restored to him his free and happy feeling. But at the same time, it tended to rob him of his independent thinking. Life in a community is apt to do that. For example, Spangenberg was not especially interested in

1. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
2. G. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

marriage, but the prevailing opinion of the home fellowship was that he could work better with a wife, so he yielded to opinion and married widow Immig, an experienced and trusted woman worker in the church. She lived until March 21, 1751, but they had no children. His second wife, Mary Elizabeth Miksch, also a widow, bore him no children either.

In general, his problem was how much to give in to the Count and to the congregation, and how much to hold to his own ideas. He was self-assertive enough to speak bluntly on impersonal issues. But when it came to his own personal welfare or position, he was apt to lean over backwards in humility. On one occasion he wanted so fully to be enclosed in the good graces of the congregation that he wrote to the Count: "If you were here I would clasp your feet until you let your heart break" (in mercy).[1] Just how much more or less, he might have accomplished independently and without association with either count or congregation, who can estimate?

Consecrated a bishop in June 1744, Spangenberg returned to America with a five-fold responsibility, arriving in Bethlehem November 30. He was to (1) conduct all official correspondence from America to the directing board of the Unity, centered at that time in Count Zinzendorf; (2) serve as Chief Elder of the Moravian Brethren in America, being the adviser and confidant of all the settlers in concerns of the soul; (3) be Chief Steward (*pater-families*) of the rapidly extending family economy of Bethlehem and Nazareth; (4) superintend all missionary affairs of the Brethren in America, including the Indian missions, the West Indies and Surinam; (5) preside over the continuing Pennsylvania Synods, three of which were held in the year 1745 alone[2] The third of these, meeting in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, had 180 members from nine denominations. Twenty-four different localities were represented. A sermon preached around this time demonstrates the unusual calmness of the man.

> On one occasion, while Spangenberg was preaching on the text of the day: 'Father, forgive them for they know not what they do,' stones

1. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
2. L. T. Reichel, *op. cit.*, pp. 159, 160.

> were thrown at him. This happened in 1745, in the town of Lancaster. He preserved his usual equanimity, and even prayed for his enemies. A magistrate who was present, and expected to see him exasperated, or to hear him denounce the wickedness of his assailants, was so deeply affected by his calmness, that he became a changed character from that hour. His enemies too desisted from their malicious behaviour.[1]

Another indication of the mettle of the man concerns a considerable legacy which he received around this time and "at once presented to the common fund,"[2] apparently in Bethlehem.

The period from 1744 to 1748 is called by Levin Reichel the heroic age of the American Moravian Church.

> A careful perusal of the diaries, journals and other papers, preserved in the Bethlehem Archives, proves abundantly that it was not love of ease or the desire for the treasures of this world that induced our ancestors to leave their own country, and to settle in the wilds of Pennsylvania; but that it was their sincere and ardent desire to proclaim among Christians and heathen the Saviour's love, and to commend the cross of Christ, the saving power of which they had experienced in their own hearts.[3]

Spangenberg was just the sort of man to inspire both greater love for Jesus Christ and faithful dedication to the tasks at hand. He remarked in one of his letters concerning the Nazareth colonists:

> They connect the Saviour and His blood with all they do or say: they highly esteem their patriarchal economy; they grow in spiritual matters, while working bodily. Nowhere else have such beautiful and edifying hymns for shepherds, ploughers, threshers, reapers, spinners, knitters, washers, sewers, and others been composed as among them and by them. They would fill a whole farmer's hymn-book.[4]

The notable fact is that this wholesome emphasis in America on the honor to be found in work for the Lord was being made simultaneously with the fanatical and frolicsome levity in Wetteravia, seized by the blood and wounds extremes. The

---

1. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 57. L. T. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 171, says the legacy amounted to £ 1082.
3. L. T. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 163.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 175.

realities of frontier life, interpreted by sound and sober leaders, seemed to spell the difference.

Reichel feels that Bethlehem at this time so much reflected Spangenberg's whole spirit that it is worth study in careful detail. The amazing truth is that not only was the Pennsylvania colony self-supporting, with no help from abroad, but it financed all "Pilgrim" matters in America, that is home and probably foreign missionary activity too. All of Bethlehem was geared for the furtherance of the gospel. A third of its residents were regularly on the way to some place of service.[1] These always represented persons withdrawn from the working power of the settlement. There was constant movement in and out. Three and four services were held on many days. Both Saturday and Sunday were given largely to religious services. The Saturday day of rest seems to have been instituted in honor of Christ's rest in the tomb before Easter Day. There were only three large houses in Bethlehem when Spangenberg arrived; family life was impossible. Part of his task was to prepare the settlement for the shift from extreme communal living to family living.

He pictured each person in the settlement as able to offer something with his hand. Even a four-year-old child could spin or pluck wool, to serve the gospel. "When the single sisters settled in Nazareth, each one took her spinning-wheel over her shoulder; and not two hours passed before each one sat down again at her wheel."[2] Tending the fire or chopping wood were regarded as something dedicated to the Saviour and as important as guarding the ark of the covenant. Anyone working, even in a stall, must realize that he was doing it for the Saviour. He was a respectable servant of Christ, like a messenger to the heathen. One's outward work, faithfully done, helped to keep the inner life healthy.

The numberless love feasts stood in close relation to daily work. Early in the morning, harvesting began with a love feast. All

1. G. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 136.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 137.

sorts of subjects were discussed in the discourses at these celebrations: dietary rules, for instance. Then the brothers and sisters separately went on their ways to harvest, singing as they went. A brother's willingness to endure kitchen duty for a whole year was sufficient occasion for a special love feast. For the married women, Frau Spangenberg would hold meetings to discuss matters like child-rearing. The women sewed, did needle-work, knitted or peeled carrots while considering their children. The genius of that day's leadership was to have the people express their religion in hard, dedicated work. All was sacred, even the stall, not rationally, but as a place of service. It would be compared to the Bethlehem stable where Jesus was born.

Spangenberg wrote on June 18, 1755, that the secular and sacred were so closely allied that one could tell immediately if a man were having difficulty spiritually by its effect on his work. He insisted that there was nothing which drove them on than their love for the "dear Lamb" and his Church.[1] Very detailed records were kept, down to every egg that was laid. Emphasis was placed on buying just at the right time, saving freight, avoiding bad loans and the like. Haggling was shunned, and fixed prices were set for both purchases and sales. Offerings from outsiders were not accepted, nor gifts, lest someone might say later: he has made us rich. Their bishop and leader clearly had a sound and orderly mind. There is a likeness in all of this to a military camp, where strict discipline and scanty bread are characteristic. With it all, people enjoyed the life, and Spangenberg tried hard to allow for individual needs and conditions. Married people got homes of their own as promptly as possible, and the shift was made to a common civil life. Special consideration was given to children, to the weak, the ill and the aged. No one went uncared for. The objective was to give a man a job to do for which he had both fitness and enthusiasm, so that he would not do it just in obedience, but in a sense of returning thanks to the Saviour. Even kindness to animals came into the community code. All of this showed the spirit of the chief planner.[2]

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 141. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 145.

New Leadership: John Frederick Cammerhof

Late in 1746 there arrived in Bethlehem a man of extraordinary ability, but steeped in Wetteravianism, John Christoph Frederick Cammerhof. Just twenty-five years of age, but already made a bishop of the church, he was sent over to be Spangenberg's assistant and especially to promote the work of evangelizing the Indians. His superior received him with unaffected joy.[1] little realizing that he was in the vanguard of a whole series of influences that would shake Bethlehem for the next five years and all but ruin what Spangenberg had begun so well.

Cammerhof was born on July 28, 1721, near Magdeburg. His father was a God-fearing justice of the peace, and his mother the kind of woman who dedicated him to God's ministry before he was born. He entered Kloster Bergen, from 1565 a Protestant school of great celebrity, and found the Saviour there. He studied hard and then went to Jena, where he met Christian Renatus von Zinzendorf. He was captivated by the emotional piety of the young count, observed at religious meetings held at Christel's and John Nitschmann's lodgings. He wanted to join the Brethren immediately, but to satisfy his parents' wishes he taught at Kloster Bergen for a time, finding high approval from Abt Steinmetz, the headmaster. He studied then at the Marienborn Theological Seminary, served as Zinzendorf's amanuensis for two years, was ordained, lived and drank in Wetteravianism, and was married to a Livonian baroness, Anna von Pahlen, just before leaving for America.

> That Cammerhoff, who was a man of excitable feelings, and whose heart overflowed with love to God, adopted the sentiments and language of his brethren and fell in with the spirit of the day, is not surprising. He did not see the evil and danger which lay concealed in these tendencies. They really edified him and constituted an expression of his inmost feelings.[2]

Cammerhof entered into a correspondence with Zinzendorf and other heads of the church, the like of which no one has attempted since his day. Copies of many of these letters are

---

1. Edmund de Schweinitz, in *Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society* (Bethlehem, Pa.: Comenius Press, 1886), II, 177.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 177.

preserved in the Bethlehem Archives, containing more than a hundred closely written pages, and presenting the minutest details not only of the work in this country, but also of the spiritual state of every individual member. What became a source of real inward grief to Spangenberg was the discovery that apparently Cammerhof had been sent with secret instructions. For one thing, the "new theology" of Wetteravia was to be introduced to America, and Zinzendorf's original idea of a Church of God in the Spirit was to be set aside.[1] Cammerhof did his best to wreck the ecumenical synods,[2] so that beginning with October 23, 1747, the synods were strictly denominational in character. Because Spangenberg protested against the tendencies that were spreading in the German churches, he was accused of growing lukewarm in the cause. His chief reason for grief was that letters he wrote in 1747 were intercepted and went unanswered by the Count.[3]

All of this underscores the unique importance of Spangenberg. If he had not been as patient and forgiving as he was, the whole Moravian effort in America could have gone off on a tangent or failed completely. He held on through thick and thin, knowing he was right, and resolved to let time and circumstance justify his position.

On October 13, 1747, Andrew Frey, formerly a member of the Seventh Day Baptist group at Ephrata, Pennsylvania, but attracted to the Moravians through attendance at the Pennsylvania Synods, came to Bethlehem, just back from a visit to Herrnhaag. He brought a report of the decline of the Brethren in Europe into frivolity and worldliness, evidence of popery and anti-Christ. His long story cannot be entered into here. Actually he was scorned by the Herrnhaagians for his lack of a sense of humor. But however exaggerated his message, it plunged Spangenberg into retirement, weeping and praying. He said that "*Papachen*" (Zinzendorf) attested great love for him, but no one did him so much wrong, over and over again.[4]

---

1. L. T. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 182.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 224.
3. G. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 152. 4. *Ibid.*, p. 153.

A few brief quotations will serve to show what the Cammerhof influence was doing to Bethlehem. In one of his letters he describes the nursery:

> The dear little ones are very lively, playful and unaffected. The wounds and the blood are their favorite theme, and their parents rejoice when they hear of the life and sufferings of the Saviour. Now and some five or six sit together on a bench and have a meeting. They sing a hymn, and one or the other tells of the Saviour's blood, how many wounds He had, etc., or they keep a love-feast.[1]

Even the lintels of the new Sisters' House were to stand as evidence of the fanaticism of this man. "That on the north side reads: *Vater, Mutter, Lieber Mann—Habt Ehr vom Jungling's Plan.* The stone on the south side contained the words, *Gloria Pleura. . .*"[2]

Yet Levering is unstinting in his praise for this remarkable young leader. He says he was extraordinary in his natural gifts, learning and eloquence, as well as in piety, zeal and energy.[3] With surprising rapidity he learned the English language, became familiar with public affairs in Pennsylvania, and mastered every feature of the work at Bethlehem and elsewhere. He devoted himself with almost reckless energy to those duties particularly which called him into the Indian country. He undertook the most arduous and perilous journeys at all seasons and in any kind of weather. He left Bethlehem on one of these hazardous trips on May 14, 1750, bound for Onondaga to secure permission of the Grand Council of the Six Nations for two Moravians to live among the Iroquois, in order to learn their language, and thus prepare the way for establishing a mission. He was joined at Wyoming by David Zeisberger, the greatest of all Moravian Indian missionaries and about the same age as Cammerhof. But because so many of the Council's members were intoxicated

---

1. L. T. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 198.
2. Levering, *op. cit.*, p. 199. It means, "Father, Holy Spirit (the Mother) and Son (the supreme man), have honor (praise) from the young men's plan, that is, the organized body of young men doing the building." The *Gloria Pleura* was in adoration of the vicarious sufferings of Christ.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 185.

and had to delay answering their request, the missionaries resolved to visit the Senecas some distance away.

> After walking for eight days, in the course of which Cammerhof's strength nearly gave way, they came to Zonesschio, the capital of the Senecas. There they found the Indians engaged in a fearful debauch; men and women, with a few exceptions, were wild with fire-water and raved through the town like incarnate fiends. It was impossible to negotiate with the chiefs or to preach the Gospel. For two nights and a day Cammerhof and his companion lay concealed in the loft of a small hut, the Bishop suffering intensely from fever, and both in constant danger of their lives.[1]

Ultimately the mission succeeded, the Council agreeing to allow two Moravians to come to learn the language. The missionaries had covered 1,600 miles in travel, but Cammerhof's health was broken. Six months later he had a hemorrhage and died at age twenty-nine, April 28, 1751.

> Christian Indians flocked to his funeral and mourned for him as for a father. In the four short years of his ministry he had baptized eighty-nine of their race, adults and children. The proud sachems of the Iroquois, assembled in council to hear from David Zeisberger an account of his death, replied in these words: 'Brother Tgirhitonti, (Bishop Spangenberg's Indian name,) you and your brethren, also those beyond the great water, have informed us that your brother Gallichwio is dead. This we have fully understood. Therefore, Brother Tgirhitonti, the Aquanoschioni (Iroquois) say to you, give diligence and seek out among your brethren another Gallichwio; for this we certainly know that he loved the Aquanoschioni well, and was toward them an upright, honest man, in whose heart no guile was found.' Thirty-one years later Zeisberger still heard his name mentioned among the far Western Indians with deep respect as the name of a great man. And such he was, without doubt. His faults were those of the time in which he lived; his merits were his own, through the grace of God.[2]

He had brought a new kind of religion, that of the blood and wounds, into America. Would it be able to displace the earlier experience?

---

1. De Schweinitz, *Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society*, II, 182.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 183.

De Watteville and John Nitschmann

The arrival in Bethlehem of Bishop John de Watteville on September 14, 1748 gave added support to the Cammerhof influence. De Watteville came on an official visit, in behalf of the Church and of his father-in-law, Count Zinzendorf. He brought with him important instructions relating both to the Indian mission and to the work of the home churches. He is described thus:

> Mild, gentle, persuasive, full of courage and zeal, his heart overflowing with the love of Christ—he was a John among his brethren, living in a daily fellowship with Jesus so real and close that he could in spirit lay his head upon the bosom of his Divine Master as the apostle did in reality. A character like this attracted Count Zinzendorf, and, at a very early period, he regarded de Watteville as his son.[1]

After studying at Jena for several years and meeting Christian Renatus there, he was actually adopted by the Count's old friend, the childless Baron Frederick de Watteville. He was ordained in 1739, at age 21, and became pastor of the church at Herrnhaag. After Spangenberg went to America, he was transferred to Herrnhut, where he became principal assistant to Zinzendorf and was married to the Countess Benigna.

In America for the first time, he made an extended tour with Cammerhof, John Martin Mack, and Zeisberger among the Delawares. They went to Wyoming, intent on finding a site for an Indian mission there, and on the way home stopped at Shamokin, now Sunbury, Pennsylvania. De Watteville was able to preach to Shikellimy, a famous Oneida chief whom the Count had met years before. His preaching made a deep impression on the proud sachem's heart, and he led him to become a follower of Jesus. About a year later the chief died with David Zeisberger as his attendant. Another of de Watteville's journeys was with Cammerhof and a companion, to the Mohicans and Wampanoags in Dutchess County, New York. Missionaries in this area had been forcibly removed some time before, but now efforts at revival were successful. The mission was renewed, and

1. *Ibid.*, p. 184.

a general revival began among the Indians. All told, de Watteville baptized twenty Indians while in Bethlehem, introducing white garments for thirteen candidates on the occasion of their baptism.[1] This custom was thereafter kept for many years.

In reference to Spangenberg's position, however, something more momentous happened. The first strictly speaking American Moravian Church synod was convened on October 23-27, 1747. Bishop de Watteville first set forth the doctrine of the Church as thereafter to be taught, making especially prominent the atonement of Christ, considered from the point of view of his physical sufferings. In the course of his explications he showed that his sympathies to some extent were with Bishop Cammerhof and that, like Count Zinzendorf, he had been tainted with the spirit which prevailed in several of the German churches.[2] Plans were unfolded for the Moravians' becoming definitely a separate denomination, thus giving up the idea of a congregation of God in the Spirit. Then came the bolt that struck Spangenberg: the office of Chief Elder in America was to be given to the Saviour. Spangenberg was "out."

"Joseph"[3] was suddenly stripped not only of this high spiritual office, but of all others with it. What hurt him most deeply was the fact that de Watteville seemed to be following Zinzendorf's instructions, all of this in a year when Spangenberg's letters abroad were unanswered!

> Spangenberg obeyed, vacated the responsible position which he had so ably filled, and went to Philadelphia, where he spent nearly a year in the seclusion of the little flock of Moravians gathered in that city. Whether there was any other cause of disagreement between this worthy man and some of his Brethren can not at this day be ascertained. But when Spangenberg and the Count met in the following year in Europe their differences were healed, and before long the former returned to his post in America.[4]

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 188.
2. *Ibid.*
3. The name given to Spangenberg while he was still on the Continent, but especially appropriate in America, where he provided for his brethren.
4. De Schweinitz, *Transactions*, pp. 189, 190.

In the middle of May, 1749, Bishop John Nitschmann arrived in Bethlehem to take charge in Spangenberg's place. He was accompanied by about 120 brethren, the third sea congregation, many of them fresh from Herrnhaag. These were followed by 81 more single brethren from Herrnhaag (the Henry Jorde colony) late in June, 1751. The impact made on American Moravianism is easily understood. Details of the experience of these settlers will be the main consideration of the next chapter. As for Nitschmann, some impressions of this well-meaning bishop have already been offered. He had many admirable qualities, but was not the man to supervise an expanding colonial settlement.

Jacob Sessler lacks sympathy for much of the Moravian religious experience, but what he has to say about Nitschmann's regime is well put:

> The American Moravians, under the Chief Eldership of Christ and the example of John Nitschmann, now cast all their worries upon the Lord and cultivated childish play, like their sisters and brothers in Herrnhaag. They forgot the frugality and thrift that had been insisted upon by Spangenberg. It was John Nitschmann's purpose to pattern the Bethlehem Economy after that of Herrnhaag, while the fields, which they had so diligently cultivated, were neglected. The result was that they had to buy what hitherto had been produced on their own land. In the year 1749, the Brethren bought 6,832 pounds of butter, 4,032 pounds of flax, 974 bushels of rye, 16,264 pounds of meat, and 1,442 bushels of wheat. The cultivation of the fields and management of the farm were neglected.[1]

Despite his being given to some of the same extremes that marred Nitschmann's religion, Cammerhof was respected by many of the Moravians' neighbors like Henry Antes. For Nitschmann, however, and the sort of thing he was advocating, Antes had little time. Levering says:

> Not only was the new departure, with its speech and manner, exceedingly distasteful to him personally, just as it was to other sensible men at Bethlehem, but he discerned under it the beginning of a drift away from scriptural soundness, and recognized a new occasion that would

1. Sessler, *op. cit.*, pp. 180, 181.

> be given for sensational public discussion of the Brethren. He understood—as John Nitschmann and those who went with him did not—how serious, in spite of the act of Parliament passed in 1749, the constant agitations of those who were trying to inflame the public against them as alleged Papists, and therefore allies of the French, intriguing with the Indians, might become, if anything within the Church should seem to lend new color to this accusation. He knew the readiness of ill-informed and credulous masses to exaggerate every accentricity or oddity reported of Bethlehem and to draw groundless inferences.[1]

Antes, being the local magistrate, was a real credit to the Moravian community, but because of Nitschmann's obstinacy he withdrew and went back to his original home in Fredericktown, Pennsylvania, and back to the Reformed faith.

John Nitschmann left Bethlehem on November 17, 1751, but earlier in that year several notable events took place. Bishop Cammerhof died in April, and Mrs. Nitschmann on February 11. One of the landmarks of Bethlehem, the Old Chapel, was dedicated on July 10, with Bishop Nitschmann leading a special service known as the *Te Agnum* (during which all knelt). A cantata written for the occasion was rendered by local musicians, Nitschmann preached on the watchword for the day, and then there was a prayer chant sung, *Te Pleuram*, expressing the thoughts associated with the significance of the Saviour's pierced side.[2] Everything took on the "new character," and a schism developed between the "old congregation" and the "new." Mrs. Nitschmann could not be buried in the ordinary fashion. Her body had to repose exactly in the middle of the graveyard. The visitor to Bethlehem today can see the grave, well-marked and conspicuously out of line with all other graves, a symbol of the whole irregularity of the time. An English-born deacon of the church in Bethlehem at the time composed the following "Poem on the Departure of our inly respected and beloved Mother Juliana Nitschman in Bethlehem the 11th Febry 1751":

---

1. Levering, *op. cit.*, pp. 248, 249.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 255, 256.

1. Thou most respected Sister!
   Choice Handmaid of the Lamb!
   There in his Cross-Register
   Bright shines thy precious Name!
   O Juliana! Sweetly rest
   Deep, deep in the warm Side-Hole,
   Deep in thy Husband's Breast.

2. With inmost veneration
   We kiss thy pale, cold Hand,
   Tho' struck with Admiration
   We weeping by thee stand,
   Yet to the Lamb's blest pow'rful Call
   Our Hearts bow and resign thee
   Altho' they break withall.

3. A balsam to the wounded
   Distrest, poor, helpless Heart;
   With Priestly Grace surrounded
   And ten'rest Mother's Smart!
   These characters we all did see
   In our dear Juliana!
   Quite native, pure and free.

4. The silent tear expresses
   O bleeding Lamb! 'fore Thee,
   More of our Heart's distresses
   Than anyone can see.
   We love our Juliana dear!
   And feel the Loss; this makes us
   Shed many a silent Tear.

5. Yes well we know she's seated
   Quite near the Lamb above,
   Her Happiness compleated,
   And drinks His bleeding Love
   Quite, quite enamour'd in her Spouse,
   And His own pierced Hand too
   The Glorious Crown bestows!

6. Now, venerable Sister!
   Our Messenger thou art,
   Think on the Cross-Register
   And dearest Johan's Smart:

Say to the Church's Head and Spouse,
'O think upon Thy Bethl'hem
'That dear afflicted House![1]

The boat bearing Nitschmann back to Europe, where he was happily recalled by the church after two and a half years in Bethlehem, passed another boat in New York harbor, bringing Spangenberg back to his post. How could he manage things now, with schism and idleness rampant in Bethlehem?

Spangenberg's Last Years in America

Before Spangenberg's activity and state of mind during his third stay in America are considered, certain factors from the years 1748 to 1751 should be noted. Levering makes it clear[2] that he was not entirely innocent of the developments that led to his recall from Bethlehem. He discreetly evaded emphases that were promulgated from headquarters. Reichel says that several pieces of correspondence[3] reflect haughtiness on the part of this generally humble man. Had he convinced the Count of constant humility, he would have continued as Chief Elder in Bethlehem. But at least in the judgment of those across the sea, he had climbed too high.

He worked in Philadelphia during the summer of 1749 with a grieved love and a wounded heart. His resentment was so great that for a time he considered splitting off from the Unity with some of his brethren and starting a new faction.[4] He had misgivings especially concerning the Lot, which de Watteville reported was approving each of the changes made. Then when the latter returned from St. Thomas, about to sail for Europe, and mentioned other dictates of the Lot, Spangenberg said he could not go along one more step in the direction projected. This happened just as de Watteville was ready to deliver a letter from Zinzendorf, naming Spangenberg once more the unrestricted manager of the American Church. Instead of de-

1. From a manuscript *Solemnia Funeralia*, etc., by John Brownfield, in the Bethlehem Archives.
2. Levering, *op. cit.*, p. 246.
3. G. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 151. 4. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

livering the letter, de Watteville deemed Spangenberg unfit for the office and said they were to return to Europe together. He excused his high-handed move on the basis of its avoiding schism or a split.

When the Count greeted his returned leaders in London on November 21, 1749, the Unity's reputation was about to collapse. It was a great loss to the American Church to have Spangenberg in Europe, but the gain to the Church as a whole was inestimable. He was charged with the responsibility of wading into large-scale literary defense of the Brethren. What a turn of events to place this crucial task on the shoulders of the man who, above all, had tried to steer the Church away from fanatical deviation and aberration! At first he could generate no enthusiasm for the assignment, asking for a missionary post in the West Indies—somewhere where he could be far away from ecclesiastical differences and doctrinal disputes.[1] But much to his credit, he thoroughly conquered himself and once more swallowed his ego in order to serve the larger cause. He spent most of 1750 in a brilliant work of apologetic, turning out a thousand quarto pages in Zinzendorf's defense and the defense of the denomination. This display of loyalty to a superior who had much wronged him is unsurpassed in ecclesiastical history.

There was little personal satisfaction in the task at first, because he still felt that he had been wronged, was not appreciated, and his purpose misunderstood. But in his memoir he says he tried to bury all wrongs done him in the depths of the sea, letting his adversities humble him and show him the way back to brotherly love.[2] The result was that he regained the confidence of his brethren and rose to a new place of esteem. The synod of Barby made him official theologian of the Unity, although he did not function in that capacity very much beyond one year until he wrote the *Idea Fidei Fratrum* in 1777. He was in the strange situation, then, in 1750, of having to defend or rectify the very matters which caused him, above all, real suffering. He did

1. *Ibid.*, p. 183.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 186.

not want acclaim for the apologetic office he filled, but his work was fully approved by the Church's synod and by more than a hundred veteran preachers and theologians outside of the Unity.[1] Best of all, Zinzendorf that June confessed to him that things probably would not have gone the way they did, had Spangenberg been with him and not in Pennsylvania. The same synod of Barby officially discarded the title *Papa* which was being used for Zinzendorf, but was one of the things that offended Spangenberg. The Count said: "I have confidence in my Spangenberg and have none but solid thoughts for him."[2] The following is a sample of the apologetic written:

> . . .supposing you heard such a man say words like these, 'I can and will hear, and know, and talk of nothing else but Jesus Christ, his passion and his wounds, his death and his precious blood, for they have won my heart for him;' would you think that man to be altogether wrong in his judgment? Would you not rather say, 'O, that man is blessed indeed! Would to God, I were like him!' He then goes on to shew that such is the experience of the Brethren. But to maintain that they neglect all other truths of God, is a vain assumption.[3]

Having thus served the Unity with nobility of spirit and profound literary skill and having regained a pleasant and intimate relationship to the Count, Spangenberg returned to America. One of his first moves was to convene synod in Bethlehem.

> The whole work of the Brethren among Christians and heathen was carefully considered. These were days of rich blessing. The internal course of the congregation was less satisfactory; for the bond of brotherly union had been broken; and a spirit of dissension prevailed. Spangenberg did all in his power to restore peace and harmony in which he succeeded by gaining the confidence of both parties.[4]

The two parties referred to were clearly the "old" and the "new," the natives and the "foreigners," the conservatives and the fervent. Whereas Nitschmann's work was divisive in character, Spangenberg had a genius for fostering teamwork. As Reichel

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 188.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 178.
3. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 112.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 66.

says, the one was all right for an altar showpiece; the other was as practical as a wagon wheel or an axle.[1] The workers who had threatened to quit work returned to their tasks, the Bethlehem economy began to run smoothly again, petty discontent faded out, and credit was restored. The bankruptcy which had faced the American church was promptly arrested. It is not going too far to say that the very improvement of the American situation and the return to financial stability may have saved the whole Unity.[2]

It should be noted that part of Spangenberg's policy was a hesitation to accept new members into the church and strictness in regard to the administration of baptism to the Indians. This was exactly the opposite with Cammerhof and de Watteville. The latter witnessed the baptism of 103 candidates on St. Thomas in six weeks, during his 1749 visit. In America only 109 Indians were baptized from 1742 until de Watteville's arrival. Then the number almost doubled within a year. The "new doctrine" was reported to produce a powerful effect. "They were carried away with the stream of grace."[3] Perhaps Spangenberg would have said, "carried away with emotion." The results are obvious. On June 1, 1748 there were 158 communicants in Bethlehem; by April, 1749 there were 630. In the opinion of some, it would have been better to keep the membership small and pure. To others, Spangenberg's Pietistic strictness accounts for the otherwise slow growth of Moravianism.

His service in America was again interrupted in 1753 by a "report mission" to Zinzendorf. He had just been to North Carolina on a dangerous reconnaissance trip in which he fell desperately ill. This trip made him indeed the founder of the Southern Province of the Moravian Church in America, about which more will be said later. Then there were plans on foot for the development of the Nazareth tract. All of this, along with the financial plight of the Unity in Europe demanded careful consideration with Count Zinzendorf. The latter was never too easy to work with, but the turn of events over the last

1. G. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 190.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 198. 3. *Ibid.*, p. 180.

five years made him realize more and more how valuable Spangenberg was to him. He knew that Spangenberg was his most capable lieutenant and is quoted by Plitt as saying: "Ich und Spangenberg sind Prinzipienmacher, Johannes (probably de Watteville) ein liebes Herz, aber kein originales Genie."[1] The admiration was mutual, for Spangenberg considered the Count an excellent man. He appreciated his unending originality and consecration, being willing to overlook weaknesses on the ground that God made him thus![2] So the last word to be spoken about their relationship is of general, mutual respect. They had a common viewpoint on most things, completed each other's personalities and felt real affection one toward the other. When he sailed for America in 1754, it was never again to see Zinzendorf. From Dover Spangenberg wrote touchingly:

> My dearest brother, I am quite sure you love me, though for some reasons, I was tempted to doubt it. Such things may happen to a poor sinner. But now I am more than ever convinced of your love to me. Farewell, beloved man! In spirit I kiss you and press you to my heart. I would rather fall on your neck and weep, than write any more, and therefore I conclude.[3]

There was great joy in America when Spangenberg arrived for his fourth and last stay, April 22, 1754. Years of grave danger were just ahead, for it was the time of the French and Indian wars. A dreadful massacre of Moravian missionaries and some of their Indian converts occurred at Gnadenhutten, Pennsylvania, late in 1755. This convinced the settlements at Bethlehem and Nazareth that they must set up careful watch against the Indians. Spangenberg had considerable correspondence with Benjamin Franklin on this and related subjects. The great American patriot had hearty praise not only for the Bethlehem defense, but for its leader as well. In 1762, following Zinzendorf's death, Spangenberg was recalled to Europe and served the Unity heroically for thirty more years, especially as president of the Unity Elders Conference. But Franklin re-

1. *Ibid.*, p. 196. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 194.
3. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, pp. 72, 73.

membered him kindly for a long time as shown by this letter to Bishop Nathaniel Seidel:

> Nathanael Seidel:
>
> Philad. June 2nd 1775.
>
> Reverend & Dear Sir,
>
> I am much obliged by your kind congratulations on my Return; and I rejoice to hear that the Brethren are well and prosper. I am persuaded that the Congress will give no encouragement to any to molest your people on account of their Religious Principles; and tho' much is not in my Power, I shall on every Occasion exert myself to discountenance such infamous Practices. Permit me however to give a little hint in point of Prudence. I remember that you put yourselves in good Posture of Defence at the Beginning of the last War when I was in Bethlehem; and then I understood from my very much Respected Friend Bp. Spangenberg, that there were those among the Brethren who did not hold it unlawful to arm in defensive Warfare. . .
>
> Excuse my Presumption in offering Advice, which indeed may be of little Value, but proceeds from a Heart filled with Affection and Respect for a Society I have long highly esteemed, and among whom I have many valuable Friends.
>
> I am with great Regard & Veneration,
> Rev'd Sir, Your most obedient, humble servant,
>
> B. FRANKLIN.[1]

This letter is quoted because it demonstrates an understandable mutual respect between Franklin and Spangenberg. They were kindred spirits in their utter practicality, their unselfishness in their work for their brethren, their thrift and industry, their originality and inventiveness and in their undying efforts to make young America grow and develop according to stalwart principles.

The account of Spangenberg's last thirty years and the religious experience of that time belongs in another place. So does the career of Bishop John Ettwein, "the outstanding figure in the Moravian Church in America during those critical years of transition which followed Spangenberg's return to Germany."[1]

---

1. Levering, *op. cit.*, p. 437.

But the stamp of the great founder of the Moravian colonies remained. It was his religious experience that prevailed, and the vitality and devotion of the era here discussed, 1740 to 1770, carried over for at least half a century.

One of the last public appearances of Bishop Spangenberg was at the celebration of the golden jubilee of the experience of the headship of Christ over his Church, September 16, 1791. This was an experience which he had at first regarded with misgivings, for it reflected some of the extremes which he consistently resisted. His patient, but firm spirit, however, brought about a tempering of the extremes and helped to give an interpretation to Moravianism that made it more acceptable to the world in the past two centuries than it would otherwise have been. His humility, which shines out above almost all his other virtues, is notably reflected in the following from his eightieth birthday:

> They have remembered in love my poor and imperfect services (that is, the Brethren) for the last fifty years, during which time I have been guilty of many errors, mistakes, and shortcomings, which will always humble me in the dust before the Lord, and fill me with heartfelt shame. They never once alluded to these my imperfections, which are great indeed. O! for those faithful souls! May the Lord bless them for it with all spiritual blessings, in heavenly places. May He own them as his own people, chosen by him in these last times for the maintenance of the truth of his gospel [1] [2]

1. Kenneth G. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. 50.
2. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 98

CHAPTER VI

THE LESSER LIGHTS

The religious experience of any group of persons can hardly be measured by looking merely at the lives of their leaders. Men like Zinzendorf and Spangenberg are sure to leave a profound impression on all persons whose lives they touch. But because of their particular stamp and mettle, they are not apt to be equalled either in their virtues or in their extravagances. This chapter is given over, therefore, to the common people of the early Moravian settlements in America. Nearly two hundred of them arrived on these shores around 1750, and most of them made their permanent homes here. The hardships and perils they faced have long been known. The line of interest now to be traced is the spiritual motivation that drove them on an made it possible for them to be "more than conquerors."

On May 12, 1749, a modest but worthy vessel, the *Irene*, landed in New York harbor with 115 Moravians aboard. This was the so-called third sea congregation. It was led by Bishop John Nitschmann and was fully organized en route into choirs, hence the name "congregation." All but nine of the passengers intended to stay in America. Twenty-five months later, on June 22, 1751, the *Irene* anchored at New York again, bringing the Henry Jorde colony of eighty single men, mainly from Herrnhaag, plus two married couples, Henry Jorde and a Negro called London. Because they were among the earliest Moravians to come to this country and because they were so steeped in Wetteravianism on leaving Europe, they become especially interesting subjects for study. Their religious experience is plainly recorded both in their private memoirs (*Lebensläufe*) and in public documents.

These memoirs, written in almost every case in German script, have been carefully preserved in the archives buildings in Bethlehem and in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Some are three or four pages in length; others run as high as ten to twelve pages. They were regularly read at the individual's funeral

service. Ordinarily the deceased would have described the first part of his life in his own words. Then the memoir would be completed by another member of the family, by a friend or by one of the local scribes. It was common practice to have new colonists bring their memoirs up to date while crossing the Atlantic. There is a considerable amount of uniformity in these records, by the nature of things; but what will be emphasized in these pages is the distinctive character of the various persons and the experience that seems to be theirs rather than the scribes'.

There were 39 single men and 48 single women in the third sea congregation. Fortunately the records are so complete that there is at least fragmentary information about 70 of these. Fifteen of them served as ministers or missionaries. The remainder served the Economy in various industries as bakers, blacksmiths, carpenters and joiners, cloth dressers, cutlers, farmers, masons, shoemakers, stocking weavers, tailors and weavers.[1] One was a bookbinder, another a fringe and lace maker, a third, a furrier. Thirty-one couples of them were betrothed and on July 15, 1749, were married in Bethlehem in one great wedding. Eventually ten of these pioneers went to North Carolina. However, 32 lived out their life span in Bethlehem; 16 died in Nazareth, 3 in Lititz, Pennsylvania; and 3 others were victims of a tragic massacre at the Indian mission station, Gnadenhutten, near the present Lehighton, Pennsylvania.

There are traces of all but twenty-five of the men who constituted the Jorde colony. Coming from the hotbed of fanaticism in Herrnhaag, they are especially interesting. Only nine of them qualified for the ministry or for missionary service, even counting those who went out as craftsmen-missionaries. Nineteen went to North Carolina to help start the settlement there. Eighteen lived out their lives in Bethlehem, eight in Nazareth, and four in Lititz. At least a quarter of them never married, and thirty went directly to Christian Spring,[2] near Nazareth, immediately upon their arrival in Pennsylvania. This unique settlement of single brethren will be given special study later in this chapter.

1. Levering, *op. cit.*, p. 234. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 253.

For years it was the food basket for the Nazareth and Bethlehem settlements.

Background and Early Experience of Colonists

Most of the persons being given special study from these two colonies originated in one or another of the German states. A few were natives of Moravia; one was from Bohemia, one from Norway and several from Schleswig-Holstein. Among the Jorde colony there were a large number from Württemberg. Their typical background was Lutheran (except for the Moravians), and the homes from which they came were usually pious or "awakened." Andreas Seifart was a notable exception, having been brought up in the Roman Catholic faith and having turned Protestant through a spiritual conflict in his fifteenth year.[1] Johann Georg Baumgarten united with the Brethren while travelling in England,[2] but most of these people lived either in Herrnhut or Herrnhaag before coming to America.

In the case of many of them, a noticeable conversion took place. It might come in the teens, in the twenties or as late as the thirties. But a first sign of being awakened was often great misery in the face of one's sinful state. One man became sure that on the basis of his prior life he was lost and condemned.[3] He appreciated the friendship gained from awakened folk, but before going to Herrnhaag acknowledged that he held on to the things of the world and secretly loved his sins. In spite of being in the Established Church, some complained that they had no one to whom they might go to pour out their hearts.

> In quiet moments I would sob and cry. I was extremely thankful that the dear Saviour in this year (1746) made clear to me, through the Holy Ghost, that He is my Redeemer and Eradicator of sin, making me an heir of the only true bliss. Light came to my soul, and I received a first taste of the word of God.[4]

---

1. Memoir of Andreas Seifart, MS, Bethlehem Archives.
2. Memoir of Johann Georg Baumgarten, MS, Salem Archives.
3. Memoir of Jacob Meyer, MS., Salem Archives.
4. Memoir of Christoph Merkle, MS, Salem Archives.

Again and again there is testimony of relief gained from a burdened conscience. This might have come as adult years unfolded, or it could come quite early. For one to feel it as early as did Johann Heinrich Herbst, at age twelve, there must have been previously a morbid sense of sin.

> I felt my deep corruption of soul, and so set my face to this need and besought the Saviour for his grace, pity and for giveness. He gave me the strength to experience in my heart his atoning blood. This verse came to me: 'His blood is juice with strength and power. Little drops can free the whole world from the devil's jaws.' What I felt in this hour I cannot describe. To him be praise and glory for it.[1]

For some of the Brethren the struggle to gain release from the sense of sin went on past their thirtieth birthdays. Great unrest is described, and a dilemma. How can the yoke of sin, pictured so frequently by the Pietistic preacher, be overthrown? The burden awaits release when a fellowship of the faithful is found. The Moravian community, freshly in the throes of a revival, offered the haven long yearned for. Weinland says:

> I fell into sin and could not endure my fear and anxiety, feeling miserable and sinful. I believed I was sold under sin and must receive grace and freedom from all sin, from the Saviour. In 1740 I heard for the first time of the Brethren, through reading a Berlin address of the Count. This led me to seek grace and godliness.[2]

Release came when the community was joined, but the sense of personal unworthiness was not forthwith forever set aside. Often it returned under the conviction aroused by hearing the atonement preached, or during serious illness, or just before death. Two days before he died, Christian Schwarz had a long "heart's company" with his pastor, during which time he confessed that he was very sinful, but wanted to withhold forgiveness from none. Thereafter, because of the able soul-ministrations of his pastor, he died with a great sense of well-being and ease.[3]

All of this sounds like a highly introvert type of religion, and indeed it was. The success of the Moravian way was that it

1. Memoir of Johann Henrich Herbst, MS., Salem Archives.
2. Memoir of Johann Nicholas Weinland, MS, Bethlehem Archives.
3. Memoir of Christian Schwarz, MS, Bethlehem Archives.

could gather in all that was introvert and then find some creative outlet for it. An inner connection with Christ would be formed, sometimes early in life, and this supplied the vitality and motive power for all other action. The inner connection was fostered by meetings of small groups that sang together or read edifying books together. The leading of God's Spirit was sought, and when it was felt, there would often be tears of joy shed. New commitment to God would be made, and all worldly diversion would be shunned.

One of the Brethren who is most revealing of this sort of thing is the above-mentioned Christian Schwarz, a schoolmaster from Vierraden in Vekermark. Aided by his parents, he was very devout from childhood. At the time of his confirmation he was drawn so close to his Lord that he longed for heaven and regretted the passing of the confirmation day that meant so much to him. Then, at his first service of Holy Communion he felt a similar unspeakable happiness. When it was over he wanted to go off to himself and have a good cry.[1] En route to Schleswig, where he was to become tutor for Frau Kalkreuth, at age 26, he poured out his soul to the Saviour in another emotion outburst, and commended his whole future course to Him. Soon after he reached America he was assigned to the settlement at Oley, Pennsylvania, where he would retire into the woods frequently. That gave him opportunity for "complaining to the Saviour about his perplexities and about his children." This he did with tears; but he said that Christ looked at him kindly, comforted and graciously helped him. One of his associates gave himself to like times of quiet meditation and discovered that fruits followed, in terms of larger agreeableness.[2]

Much of what has been said thus far about these "common folk" lies in the area of their quest for personal salvation. This emphasis has never been lacking in Moravianism. Indeed, to many it is the very heart of things. Man's highest good is to be in harmony with God's purpose and will. This is to be accom-

1. *Ibid.*
2. Memoir of John Michael Sautter, MS, Salem Archives.

plished by the surrender of one's will and heart to him in faith. It is a venture of faith to respond to God's grace, and it is a venture of love. Therefore it was natural that a cobbler should pray to the Saviour to help him be contented in his work.[1] And as he prayed thus, he also asked himself repeatedly: "Have I a heart-felt love for Christ?" If love were warm and free, it was believed Christ would grant salvation.

There was a gardener in Wachovia, as the area settled in North Carolina by the Moravians was called, who was both adroit and lucky in his work, so he felt. He gained the reputation for making Bethabera fertile in the midst of a heap of stones. His quest for salvation was long and fascinating. At seventeen the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said that he must die and go over to the other world.

> I was afraid and anxious, feeling an unrest in my heart. But I thought I had really died. And as I was drawing my last breath and my life was coming to an end, I awakened with a loud cry. I aroused the people in my father's house. They came to my bed, but I was unable to speak for a quarter of an hour. Then a song came to me about Jesus, my Friend. I repeated it in these words:
>
> 'Lamb of God, my Bridgegroom,
> Without Thee we shall become nothing here on earth.'
>
> Fear lay in my heart, and I could not tell my parents what I had dreamed. I did not want to live in this world any more, for only fear, dread, fright and sin are in it. I had no desire to sin any more, but was not free from it. I was living continually in unrest, for I did not truly know the Man who shed his blood on the cross for me.[2]

Sometime later Lung learned the baker's trade and went about looking for work. Finally, he landed in the army of the Grand Duke of Florence and then fell sick. His restlessness dogged his paths until one day he heard a powerful sermon which plunged him into deep fear. He thought now that he was sitting in hell, with the flames striking around him. He knew himself to be lost unless he would alter his course. An assurance of salvation came soon afterward, when he started correspondence with Herrnhaag. He took to himself the extravagant language of the

1. Memoir of Johann Heinrich Herbst, MD., Salem Archives.
2. Memoir of Jacob Lung, MS, Salem Archives.

Wetteravian settlement because it seemed to say something to his soul. On arriving in Carolina he expressed the wish that as long as he should be in that place, he might give himself with body and mind to the Lamb and to his blood-community. As late as on his 49th birthday, he still had ecstatic experiences of the salvation he was sure was his. "In spirit I kissed his hand, split with the nails." The supplement to his own memoir says that he walked closely with the Saviour and spent his time in blessedness of communion with him. The language of much of this sounds strange to twentieth century ears, but it is an effort of honest souls to express confidence that God, as revealed in Christ, not only saves a man's soul for the future, but is a present, living companion. The days demanded this confidence, and the sense of present salvation surmounted all uncertainty.

The very word used for deity in so many of these records is indicative of the importance of salvation. The word is *Heiland*, Saviour. The emphasis is not so much on the might and power of God, or even on the sacrificial atonement of Christ; it is on God as the bringer of salvation. The initiative comes from this saving God:

> Our Saviour touched my heart very powerfully; I felt my corruption and vileness, and that in this state I would not be saved. This made me very uneasy, and being desirous to obtain rest for my heart, I tried many ways, in an honest and pious life bought good books, went constantly to church, wept and prayed often to God; for I had heard nothing of our Saviour, and that he must free the heart from evil and not I. But I found rest in nothing. I fell and arose again for three years together.
>
> In the year 1733 I reached Augsburg on a general fast day, and the minister was preaching on Isaiah 28:15—'We have said: We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement.' While these words were being explained, our Saviour drew nigh my heart, and I was awakened with many tears.[1]

Another man tells a similar story of how the Shepherd was seeking his sheep. One's life is not his own; God calls to claim

1. Memoir of Philip Meyer, who came to America with the first Sea Congregation, but speaks much about his Herrnhaag days, MS, Bethlehem Archives.

it for his service. He is ever the seeking God, leaving us to respond to him.

> He has made me blessed to bring me to acquaintance with his wounds. He would often say, he would not be my Saviour if I were not a poor creature. 'It is pure grace and pity; to me it is nothing at all. When I look upon myself, I desire to pass away. But his free love and compassion, with which he; daily holds me fast, brings me through.[1]

Sometimes it is the third person of the Trinity who is represented as seeking men out for God: "I found I could really do nothing right of myself, but the Holy Ghost took me in his school and showed me my corruption and great misery."[2] More characteristically this is the work of Christ, who is answered thus: "Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee from my heart, and that thy death and suffering is larger and more important than all else."[3] So important is the saving work of Christ, and so urgent is his call that when commitment is made to his service, and the *Gemeine* (congregation) is joined, one's life is fully given over. When the carpenter, Andreas Seifart, agreed to go with the Moravians to America, he said he felt his decision was due to a kind of temporary madness. 'But the Saviour helped me and placed me in the right niche."[4] As for Anna Rosina Kerner, who married a skilled organ-builder, she felt that both she and others had been "destined to go"[5] to Pennsylvania.

Joining Moravians Brings Mixture of Peace and Trials

The critical point in the religious experience of these people must have been the first years of their stay in the *Gemeine*. Was the peace of mind and release of soul which they found worth the price? Something came before the group again and again to trouble them externally. Was the internal satisfaction worth it all? We have no way of knowing how many decided that it was not. Certainly dozens must have left both Herrnhaag and

1. Memoir of Andreas Gross, MS., Salem Archives.
2. Memoir of Friedrich Jacob Pfeil, MS., Salem Archives.
3. Memoir of J. H. Herbst, MS., Salem Archives.
4. Memoir of Andreas Seifart, MS., Salem Archives.
5. Memoir of Anna Rosina Tanneberger, MS., Bethlehem Archives.

Herrnhut rather than have to go to far-off America, leaving their loved ones and the native land they loved so well. But there is available the record of those who stayed with the Church, and it shows some rather amazing sacrifices.

Christian Schwarz, for instance, caused a split between his mother and father when he and his sister were converted. Their father would have nothing to do with their newly found religion. Their mother was happy about it, but not until several years passed was the breach healed. Meanwhile, Schwarz gave up a number of teaching positions that paid him rather well and went to Herrnhut, where he said he would rather die of starvation with a people of God than be somewhere where the body was well nourished but the spirit would dry up. Actually at Herrnhut he was ill for about six months, but he believed it was simple diet that led him back to health.

Just before being mustered out of the Württemberg army, Christoph Merkle was told by the duke that he should adopt the Catholic faith. But the young soldier replied that he would rather lose body and life than do so. He was certain that joining the Brethren was his only course. Maria Margaret Drews had an even more frightening experience. She was employed in Altenkampf by a family that would not release her, even though she had reached her twenty-third year. Her parents were also against her going to Herrnhut. But, sure of her ground, she took up the new life with the Brethren, even though it cost her all her possessions, which were lost in transit.[1] For Johann Nicholas Weinland no sacrifice was too great, compared to the bliss experienced. He took a minor position in the single brethren's choir at Herrnhaag in 1747 and was so happy and satisfied at heart for six months afterward that he could scarcely believe it. Philip Meyer sold books costing 200 gilders for 80 gilders in order to go to Herrnhaag, and after arriving, he said: "I was not there a quarter of an hour before my heart was powerfully laid hold on by our Saviour, in so much that I believed it would not be finer in heaven."[2] For Herbst, after six weeks on the Atlantic,

1. Memoir of Maria Margaret Enerson, MS., Bethlehem Archives.
2. Memoir of Philip Moyer, MS., Bethlehem Archives.

the fellowship at Bethlehem made him so heartily thankful and happy that he wished his parents, brothers and sisters might all enjoy the same felicitous atmosphere with him. And so the testimonies run.

A large number of the Henry Jorde colony had served in the army, especially under the Duke of Württemberg. This training and discipline at the time seemed to them quite useless, but many of them later used their military gifts to try to defend their Brethren against Indian raids. When the Duke allowed some of the Brethren to leave the Württemberg army in 1748, eleven were mustered out at once. A little later Johannes Nagel followed them, but it cost him twenty florins to be discharged![1] For Gottfried Schwarz[2] the price of release was thirty reichsthaler. Other ex-soldiers to be encountered in this chapter include: Jacob Lung, Johann Balthasar Hege, Andreas Gross, Stephen Meyer, Johannes Nagel, John Michael Sautter and Christoph Merkle.

Nagel was a soldier's son, so a military career came naturally to him. Jacob Lung served in the army of the Grand Duke of Florence for a few months, but left to work as a baker and then serve the Duke of Württemberg. The total extent of his military service was eleven years. How different the gardens of Bethabara, North Carolina, must have seemed to him years later! Gottfried Schwarz was a soldier for fourteen years and divided that period between seven ordinary years and seven in which he met in regular fellowship with other awakened soldier-Brethren who had been visited by Henry Nitschmann and others. Hege met with the group, too, although his awakening came as a result of hearing sermons on the sufferings of Jesus by a Lutheran pastor at the royal fortress of Alt Preisach. Later another pastor, a chaplain, set forth the wounds of Jesus in a "heart-touching manner,"[3] with the result that Hege bought a Bible and read it diligently. John Michael Sautter joined the

1. Memoir of Johannes Nagel, MS., Salem Archives.
2. Memoir of Gottfried Schwarz, MS., Bethlehem Archives.
3. Memoir of Johann Balthasar Hege, MS., Salem Archives.

army at age seventeen and served fifteen years. He found his Lord in an especially intimate fashion while on night watch. Christoph Merkle fought in a Rhine campaign with Prince Eugenius, earning a high reputation for his honesty. But then he decided to desert, hearing that the duke wanted to sell his regiment to the emperor. But troubled by his conscience, Merkle rejoined the regiment.

All of these incidents serve to illuminate later developments and make it easy to understand why the discipline, privations and hardships of congregational life on the frontier seemed bearable. Joining the *Gemeine* was a happy privilege. To set oneself apart from the world was a pleasure, and giving one's life-long loyalty was the expected procedure.

Actually the list of reasons why these people joined the Moravians is quite long. Army contacts have been mentioned. This was a fertile field, and it was kept fertile by Nagel's correspondence with Herrnhaag. He received regular news from the *Gemeine* for several years and circulated it in meetings with his fellow soldiers. As new recruits came into the regiment, they too were invited to share the inspiration. Melchior Münster is among a minority of these colonists who grew up in Herrnhut in a Moravian family,[1] although Anna Rosina Kerner had contact with the fellwoship at an early age. For Jacob Meyer the first Moravian contact was reading Zinzendorf's Berlin sermons; the same was true of Johann Nicholas Weinland. Carried along by enthusiasm for their revival, the Brethren used many means for spreading their good news. The preaching of humble pastors touched Herbst and Gottlieb Fockel.[2] And then there was the matter of casual visits. A people on fire as enthusiastically as the Brethren engaged in private conversations during visits with their friends that were just as effective as preaching. This is what won Maria Margaret Drews and Andreas Seifart.

One of the most appealing notes in these memoirs is that so many of the Brethren influenced others while working at their trades. Matters of earning a living and seeking one's soul's salvation went hand in hand. Andrew Rillman was enlisted for

1. Memoir of Melchior Münster, MS., Salem Archives.
2. Memoir of Gottlieb Fockel, MS., Salem Archives.

the cause while working with a fellow stocking weaver named Nixdorf:[1] Hans Petersen was an apprentice to a tailor when Jens Christensen influenced him;[2] Philip Meyer was becoming a master in his trade at Strassburg when awakened souls influenced him. Even correspondence out of Herrnhaag to an enquiring soul like Jacob Lung could win a convert. And a single visit there was enough to convince at least five of these people that here was the environment which they should choose.[3]

One could make a reasonable generalization about these folk: they were all of a definitely emotional disposition. The Herrnhaag environment excited them and made them part of a new religious movement, an enthusiastic one. At the same time, they had a remarkable sense of security there. For instance, this is how Philip Meyer reacted to Herrnhaag in 1740 already:

> The Brethren and Sisters appeared to me like angels of God. All my former piety fell off, and I looked upon myself as the very worst. And as our Saviour was soon pleased to let me feel, as a poor sinner, grace in his wounds, I longed also to be a member of the congregation. This came to pass seven weeks after my arrival, the 17th of December, the same year. Here I lived cheerfully and happily and resolved to end my life in no other place but here. Nevertheless, a great deal was being talked of pilgrimage. This caused me a new uneasiness of heart, and our Saviour made a claim of me. But I would not believe that he wanted me for a pilgrim. I thought he would not let me stir from Herrnhaag lest my heart should be hurt in the world. The Saviour kept pressing his claim, though, and on October 13, as I was carrying letters to Orttinburg, he changed my mind. The moment I submitted my will to the Saviour, my heart was easy, and I was able to confide in him. He preserved me in his wounds.[4]

To Rosina Schulius the settlement in Wetteravia was "our dear Herrnhaag."[5]

---

1. Memoir of Andrew Rillman, MS., Bethlehem Archives.
2. Memoir of Hans Petersen, MS., Bethlehem Archives.
3. Viz., Johannes Franz Steup, Johann Christian Richter, Christian Schwarz, Friedrich Jacob Pfeil and Paul Christian Stauber.
4. Memoir of Philip Meyer, MS., Bethlehem Archives.
5. Memoir of Rosel (Rosina) Kremser, MS., Bethlehem Archives.

To Andreas Seifart it was the place where he felt a close familiarity with the wounds. But at the same time, he had to admit:

> My six weeks' stay did not, indeed, yield my heart very much, for I fell away from my simplicity. This caused me in later time to shed tears of regret. But the good Saviour by his grace helped me back to the right path.[1]

The emphasis on simplicity sounds like Spangenberg.

As far as Jacob Lung was concerned, Herrnhaag was most inspiring. On his first visit he saw a picture of Jesus there, probably on the cross, and it impressed him deeply. He resolved to live "from the juice of his wounds,"[2] wherever he might be. When he returned later to the same place, he remarked: "The dear Saviour was so near that I thought I had to melt before his pierced feet." Herbst, however, coming to the settlement around the same time, perceived the danger in extremes and resolved not to allow himself to be confused. He was concerned to discover that some of the brethren were not living to the praise and joy of the Saviour. Fockel is the most outspoken in his criticism of the fanaticism. He says he became so confused during the Sifting Time that it took him three years to come out of it. He found that he had lost his true connection with the Saviour and his pleasure in religion. Only after he went to Bethlehem and started life andw could he get to feel attachment to his Lord again and be confident of his forgiveness.

The Voyages to America

There is a significant connection with the Moravian mission in Greenland that should be mentioned at this point. Travelling with the third sea congregation to America were three missionaries bound for Greenland and three of their converts. The latter were among the fruits of this difficult mission, founded in 1734. The fact of the matter is that the mission failed to produce one convert in its first four years. Regardless of what the missionaries said, the people slammed the door in their faces. If they read the scriptures, they mimicked them; if they taught, the people sneered; if they told them the gospel story, the only

1. Memoir of Andreas Seifart, MS., Bethlehem Archives.
2. Memoir of Jacob Lung, MS., Salem Archives.

replies were stories about the Greenland *angekoks* or medicine men. Then one day Missionary John Beck had a group of Eskimos come to him. He followed the usual procedure of expounding dogmatic theology to them, but it had little effect. On impulse, he picked up what he had been translating, a page from Matthew's gospel, and began reading the Agony in Gethsemane. A young man named Kayarnak heard: "and he took with him Peter. . . .Let this cup pass from me" and

> At these words, Kayarnak, with a sudden cry, sprang forward to the table; his eyes shone like stars, and his voice trembled with emotion. 'What is that?' he asked. 'Tell me that again; for I, too, would be saved.' By the Brethren's dogmatic theology he had been entirely unaffected; by the story of Gethsemane and Calvary he was thrilled and transformed; and next year (March 30th, 1739), he was publicly baptized as the first-fruit of the Greenland Mission.[1]

This was just about the time Count Zinzendorf was beginning to preach his blood and wounds theology. Andrew Grassman, coming on an inspection visit, brought this theology to Greenland, and so the approach to the Eskimos was permently altered. Indeed, the Moravians now adopted a technique that has been their most effective approach wherever they have established missions—preaching the atonement, Christ crucified for sinful man. Repentance replaced complacency among the Eskimos, sins were confessed, and baptism was requested. Noting the remarkable change, John Beck wrote to Zinzendorf: "Henceforth, we shall preach nothing but the love of the slaughtered Lamb."[2]

To return to the "200" who came to America around 1750, it should be noted how many of them had remarkable advantures after casting their lot with the Brethren. New situations were encountered, risks were multiplied, and sights were raised far higher than these folk had ever dreamed. The case of Maria Margaret Drews was mentioned above, (p. 188). After losing all her possessions when she came to Herrnhaag, she experienced

---

1. J. E. Hutton, *A History of Moravian Missions* (London: Moravian Publication Office, 1922), pp. 71, 72.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

other insecurity. She was transferred to the Moravian settlement in Holland, then to England, and finally to America. But she showed enthusiasm at every turn and tried to enjoy little blessing as it came. Her marriage to Evert Enerson began happily, but two of their children died in infancy, and she herself was forced to lay down her life at age 42. The mortality rate among Moravian infants was high, just as it was among most American pioneers.

The total distance travelled by these people is amazing. Some went from town to town learning their trades, later to settle down in the communities of the *Gemeine*; others, like Johann Richter and Jacob Meyer were in and out of Switzerland. By the time they sailed for America, many were accustomed to living the life of a pilgrim. While on ship they plied their trades without interruption. Even Andreas Seifart, who was injured and had a leg that would not heal, patched shirts while obliged to be quiet. They were "called" to go where they were going. It was all a holy adventure! The storm that came up while the third sea congregation crossed the Atlantic was nothing new to a young woman like Rosina Schulius. A native of Zauchtenthal in Moravia, she became an orphan at age six. Her brother, with whom she lived, got into trouble with the Austrian army when he went to visit Herrnhaag. They believed him to be a Prussian spy. He was to have been hanged, but right in the moment of the execution, while the rope was around his neck, the soldiers were distracted by a cry of attack, so he was able to flee. He came to Rosina in the field where she was tending sheep and must have frightened her by his changed appearance. He asked her to leave immediately and come with him, which she was willing to do only after recognizing him by a scar on his hand. At age twelve, then, she came to the Fulneck settlement of the Moravians, and her adventures continued during the rest of her brief life. She died as a missionary in the West Indies after giving birth to a son in her thirty-third year.

In America, of course, there were hardships a plenty. Rugged faith was demanded to endure the frontier rigors, and even with that, some must have fallen into discouragement. Many

of the unrealities that sprang up in Wetteravia, then, evaporated on the frontier. Christ was not so much the happy bridegroom whose coming the redeemed should celebrate with festive extravagance as he was the fellow-worker standing by the man felling trees and clearing the land. His parable of the stony soil and thorny ground struck Johann Georg Baumgarten with new reality as he gave himself to sweat and toil in the new settlement of Salem in North Carolina. Herbst, making the long trip from Wilmington on the Carolina coast, up the Cape Fear River to Springfield, and thence to Wachovia, sensed in those ten days of loneliness something of the loneliness of Jesus in the wilderness for forty days. There was more to be gained in the life of their Lord than just the cross and passion.

Pfeil and Merkle, two of the first settlers of Wachovia, catalog their hardships, while at the same time expressing gratitude for the Saviour's leading. Pfeil was not always healthy, but willingly gave time to nursing the other men of the settlement when he was able. He was a cobbler by trade, but fitted into other trades too. Because leather was hard to procure, he established a tannery also. Merkle was sick at intervals, too, and felt depressed when several of his friends died. There was a disastrous epidemic in 1759, and, of course, the dangers from Indian raids were always great. Exhausting as the life was, however, Pfeil lived to age 75, and Merkle to 85.

The Christiansbrunn Settlement

In the same year that the third sea congregation arrived, there was established on the Nazareth tract a center of agriculture, especially the dairy industry, with a mill and other minor adjuncts. It was named *Christiansbrunn*, or Christian Spring, after Zinzendorf's son, Christian Renatus. The name was especially appropriate because so many of the former members of Christel's choir at Herrnhaag were resettled there. During the period of this study, the following, already introduced in the early part of this chapter, were found among its residents: Petersen, Lung, Herbst, Meyer, Merkle, Nagle, Fockel, Christian and Gottfried Schwartz. The plantation had just been laid out a short time before the Jorde colony arrived, so thirty of its

members were assigned to develop it. The work was strenuous, as testified to by Johann Herbst, who was not used to that sort of labor, especially the hauling of wood and stone to Nazareth, where a manor house for Zinzendorf was being erected. The practical and gifted Henry Antes was called on to supervise the venture. One can just imagine how[1] successful it would have been through the years had Antes not become disgusted with the John Nitschmann regime and left the Moravians. As it was, things went very well for more than a generation. Besides highgrade agriculture, threshing, breaking hemp and the like, there were masonry and carpentry, brick-making and the burning of lime in kilns. The Brethren evidently discovered that lime was good for the Pennsylvania soil around the same time as did Benjamin Franklin. Flax and oats were raised; cows, sheep, hogs and bees were kept. Morning prayer preceded each day's work, and every Saturday and Sunday included an elaborate schedule of religious meetings.[2] A few married couples lived in the vicinity, but the principal residents were single men and older boys. Life was apparently so satisfying that the single brethren did not worry about the prospect of marrying or the shortage of eligible brides.

The quarters were crowded, so that one knows there was little privacy for any of the brethren. Discipline was strict, and anyone who violated the civil law was an offense to the spiritual citizenry. Brother Scheffler, for instance, was kept away from communion for a time, because he was arrested by the sherriff for cutting down a pear tree on a neighbor's property and was brought to trial in the county court. Roads and bridges were built to other settlements, weaving was introduced, and in one autumn a bumper crop of 3,700 bushels of wheat, corn, oats and buckwheat was harvested. One of the leaders of religious service was David Zeisberger, the central hero of Chapter VII. Christian Schwarz began a "scribes' room," where the boys were taught to keep church records, and vocal and instrumental music was taught.[3]

1. Levering, *op. cit.*, p. 190.
2. From the Diary of the Christiansbrunn settlement, MS. in the Nazareth Moravian Church, p. 1. Portions are translated by Frederick Schramm.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

One of the attractive features of life at Christiansbrunn was the coming and going of visitors. Missionaries came and told tales of the propagation of the gospel in the West Indies, among the American Indians, Berbice and other places. Sick Indians were brought in for nursing care, the hospitality was available for worthy and unworthy alike. Philip Meyer was one of the choir leaders. House meetings, led by the choir leader, decided on points of order. For example, on September 10, 1767: "In our dormitory and dining hall better order can be created. Fishing and hunting, especially on Sundays, shall henceforth be discontinued."[1] Admonitions given against possible extravagances in youth reflect the presence of moral teaching. References are made occasionally, too, of members who had left the settlement but returned, penitent and seeking reinstatement. As for religious services, there were many: love feasts, song services, breakfasts with spiritual significance, and preaching services. While he was in Pennsylvania, Spangenberg was a favorite preacher. One can imagine the wholesome influence which he would exert in the face of possible extravagances. The following is a typical entry in the diary:

> January 9, 1763, Boys' Choir festival day. In the afternoon the choir had their festival lovefeast with a nice feeling. At four o'clock Brother Nathanael gave them a complete and heart-searching choir talk about the children's text: 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.' After the supper, with the boys and youths united with their laborers and overseers, a cup of covenant was enjoyed. Then the entire choir concluded by worshiping and thanking *the boy Jesus* for all the grace of this day, which they had enjoyed. Many tears were flowing. It was indeed a real day of blessing for our poor boys. We must confess that the Saviour has been especially manifested anew.[2]

In the face of debts which accumulated for the Unity as a whole by 1765, Brother Nathanael (Seidel) said:

> We might think, what can we do in regard to the debts of the church and community as a whole? How can we help? We have no earnings and income of money. But Brother Nathanael said to us, that

1. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

> we with our industry and plantation work should give our contribution, if the dear Saviour adds his blessings as he has done in the past. We should give more than some other brethren and sisters, who are working for themselves. It is necessary that we be faithful and do our work to the Saviour with our whole heart. And when the Saviour will pour out his blessings on Christian Spring as he has done before, we also will do our share. Our hearts were as wax, and we sympathized in a special manner with his servants and what he has done for them in that synod.[1]

What happened, then, was that some of the same men who in their youth enjoyed the festivities and extravagances of Herrnhaag in their advanced years toiled unselfishly and untiringly to restore the financial stability of the Unity. Christian Spring was successful in its early days, but by April 1, 1796, it was closed out as an establishment for single men, and the farms and industries were put into the hands of men with families. Levering analyzes the decadence as partially due to the excessive use of strong drink.[2] Hamilton adds that by this time all the choir establishments, especially those for single men, in America, were in a decadent condition.[3]

There are two subjects suggested by the life at Christiansbrunn which affected all these early colonists: disciplinary measures exercised by the church, and the way work was linked with worship. Church discipline was strict but logical. If disputes arose between members, every effort was made to settle them and bring peace.[4] One man had a rough and hot-headed nature that had to be handled with love and patience.[5] Another, though lively and cheerful and regularly punctilious, admitted that he had quarrels with various brothers and could be sharp.[6] Humility seems to have saved Gottfried Schwarz, for though his character had its rough sides from back in his soldier days, he always remembered that he was a sinner, expressing penitence with tears. His genuineness withal probably accounts for his having been chosen Choir Disciple several times.[7]

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 28. 2. Levering, *op. cit.*, p. 540.
3. J. T. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church*, p. 292.
4. Adelaide L. Fries, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina* (Raleigh, N. C.: 1922: North Carolina Historical Commission), I, 203.
5. Baumgarten. 6. Weinland. 7. Gottfried Schwarz.

If spirits were disturbed when a communion season came around, they were bidden to remain away from the Lord's Table. When right relationships had been re-established between men, and forgiveness had been asked of God, church privileges were restored. One man, who made the rounds of most of the American Moravian settlements, kept bad company while in Bethlehem. He associated with persons who were hostile toward the Brethren, so he was kept away from the sacrament temporarily.[1] Like Jacob Meyer, he had children who kicked over the traces and were dismissed from the congregation. But an even more pathetic soul was Friedrich Pfeil. He often lamented in his old age that he had not lived more to the Saviour's honor. He regretted that the misuse of strong drink, to which he had given himself in younger days, came back at certain times. This not only caused him to forfeit joys in the *Gemeine* but also caused grief to his brothers and sisters. He appreciated the help his friends tried to give him on this problem and accepted the regulations imposed.

Much patience was shown toward a troubled or discontented soul, but if it became evident that a man could or would no longer be one of them, if he no longer fitted into religious and community life or if he were a source of anxiety and sorrow and showed no sign of wishing to be changed, he was quietly asked to move away and live elsewhere. This happened to Heinrich Feldhausen.[2] The diary for June 17, 1762, Bethabara, North Carolina, says he left that day with many tears. He had put the brewery and distillery into the best of order, but yielded to carnal desires and fell into all kinds of sin and shame, so that the Brethren could no longer keep him.

The discipline of the communities was closely related to their work. The ideal was every man working for the good of all, asking God's blessing upon his work. This left no room for the selfish, restless or fretful man. A premium was placed on faithful service, of whatever variety one could render, rather than on a special function such as preaching. One might be distinguished

1. Memoir of Paul Christian Stauber, MS., Salem Archives.
2. Fries, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, I, 247.

for efficient storekeeping, for accurate bookkeeping, diligent night watching, good cooking, or for reporting lucidly to Europe the progress of affairs in America. David Tanneberger glorified God by his organ building. Johann Weinland was praised for his diligence and faithfulness as overseer of the Nazareth farms; John Sautter wrote verses during one of his night watches in Wachovia: "Immanuel, who was with me in my first watch, Ever continue and take good care of me."[1] Even Dorthea and Jacob Meyer, upon undertaking their work as keepers of the tavern in Bethabara (and later in Salem) said they wished to do their work in heavenly trust in the Saviour, whose blessing they were sure they might enjoy. Meyer was a colorful character, not overly blessed with ambition, but suited to his position. Visitors in the Moravian community were offered facilities of the tavern, but did not always use them well. Two "Regulators" (local patriots) once stood before Meyer with naked swords and threatened to stap him unless he yielded the key to the wine cellar. He understood their condition and persuaded them to leave. On another occasion, a soldier coming through Salem hit him on the head so hard that he was never again the same. Then the tavern caught afire some time later, but in all his trials he felt the Saviour delivered him. God kept his protective hand over his own.

Traits in the members of the community which are repeatedly acknowledged are open, sincere dispositions, happiness, cheerfulness, the attitude of thankfulness, neatness in working habits, inner well-being, self-effacement and co-operative teamwork. With persons working so close together, these were indispensable, no matter what the trade or vocation. Even[2] in Greenland, associated with America as noted above, the converts were encouraged to sing hymns while they gathered berries. A complete unification of the sacred with the secular was intended. For the workers of this era who gave full time to missionary work at home or abroad there was also commendation for faithful work.

1. Memoir of John Michael Säutter, MS., Salem Archives.
2. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

One of these began the work at York, Pennsylvania, Gottfried Engel.

> He at once began to effect a deeper spiritual atmosphere within the congregation, by prayer gatherings and 'Sing Stunde.' With the advent of the New Year, 1754, he inaugurated a protracted series of services which continued until the last week in April. This became a time of great soul-searching in York, and many souls sought and found peace at the foot of the Cross of Christ.[1]

The life of these people was the success of the Church. If they were making a contribution toward this success, their reward was sufficient.

Attitude toward Death

The most famous member of the Henry Jorde colony has not been mentioned so far. He was John Matthew Otto, brother of an earlier resident of Bethlehem with a similar name. Both men were physicians, and John Matthew was also a surgeon. This Dr. Otto was part of the Bethlehem settlement for thirty-six years. His service to residents of the Moravian community, to neighbors, to missionaries and even to Indians was inestimable. Three of his famous patients were Justice Daniel Brodhead, William Tatemy, son of a famous old Indian chief, and the Swedish Baron von Hermelin. The justice came up the Delaware to be treated for cancer of the throat, but died in Bethlehem. Tatemy, a Christian Indian of prominence outside the Bethlehem community, was shot without provacation just before an important conference was to be held on Indian matters. Dr. Otto was unable to save his life, but brought the Baron, an eminent mineralologist, back to health. A man deeply devout and given to prayer, the physician attended many a sick Revolutionary soldier quartered in Bethlehem and introduced inoculations against small pox in Bethlehem in 1773, saving many lives.

The North Carolina settlement was not so fortunate. An epidemic, almost surely typhoid, struck Bethabara less than six years after its beginning, took the lives of ten adults and two children (a high proportion for the size of the community), and

---

1. S. C. Albright, *The Story of the Moravian Congregation at York, Pennsylvania* (York, Pa.: The Maple Press, 1927), p. 106.

most devastating of all, the life of Dr. Hans Martin Kalberlahn, on whom everybody depended so much. The faith of the settlement was sorely tried, and these lines by Gottlieb Reuter were offered as comfort and assurance:

> Lord Jesus Christ, Thou art so true,
> Thou art so merciful to all;
> We pray for grace Thy will to do,
> To trust Thy love whate'er befall.[1]

The optimism of the Brethren is shown by their remembering in their diary that nineteen passed through the summer unscathed. Then they added: "The time of sickness in July, August and September, was also a time of special grace when the sincere love and friendship of the Brethren for each other, joy in and longing for the Saviour, flourished, and were plainly seen"[2]

As brothers are born for times of adversity, so it was on the Moravian frontier. Lingering illness was attended with loving service and comforting devotions. At the time of death, a brother's choir gathered around, offered prayers, chanted liturgies and sang favorite hymns. Some would say that the early Moravians were preoccupied with the matter of death. One of their number[3] confessed that it was the sight of so many deaths in his section of the Ruhr at age twelve that first made him seek God. But what may seem from the memoirs to be a pre-occupation with the subject of death must be tempered by awareness that these records were completed for use at funerals. That is why many of them devote as much as one third of the memoir to the deceased's last hours.

The fact that so many of their number died in their thirties and forties kept the brevity of life regularly before them. There was a high rate of accidental death, and the frequency of infant mortality has been noted. At times, early death was looked upon as a favor from heaven. Christoph Merkle, who lived to be eighty-five, saw many of his friends called ahead of him, so that

1. Fries, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, I, 222.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 207. 3. Jacob Meyer.

he came to believe he must be esteemed the poorest sinner, in need of patience until he should be called. But it would be a call "home," not to uncertain regions. And for the Moravians, the term was "fall asleep," not simply "die." One would take the Martyr-Man by the hand and be released to enjoy eternal peace in Jesus' arms and bosom. In its worst description, death could be analyzed thus: "Now he is at home there (in heaven) and kisses the wounds, and I am still here, and he comforts me with his nearness until I shall also see him."[1] If a loving and trustful look were seen on the dying, it was special favor to be noted. And as the choir of the departed sang, this would often be the hymn:

> The Saviour's blood and righteousness
> My beauty is, my glorious dress;
> Thus well arrayed, I need not fear,
> When in his presence I appear.[2]

Life among the Colonists in Wachovia

Scattered references have previously been made to the early history of the Moravian settlements in North Carolina. Since the purpose of this study is not primarily to trace out historical events but rather to discover developments of religious experience, no detailed chronicling will be attempted even now. However, there was a characteristic life in North Carolina, especially of the groups in Bethabara and Salem, that is worth noting. The choir system was fully developed and is easily recalled today around the square of Old Salem, where the Brothers' House faces on the west side of the square and the Sisters' House on the east side. Work was mingled with worship, as in Pennsylvania, and the task of clearing the land and preparing it for agriculture demanded just as much of the pioneers of this area.

It should be recalled that it was Bishop Spangenberg who in 1752-53 led the party of reconnaissance and chose the 100,000 acres for Moravian habitation in Carolina. This expedition was

1. Memoir of Jacob Lung, MS., Salem Archives.
2. This hymn was written by Count Zinzendorf and is still part of the Moravian burial service today.

a perilous one, taking them inland fully 400 miles from Edenton. Severe illness all but defeated their purpose, but Spangenberg's spirit, characteristically described in the following lines, kept them advancing until suitable ground was found.

> Who waits until the Saviour leads,
> Will see the joy intended;
> No anxious questions will he need
> With difficulties ended.[1]

This was the faith on which the new colony was founded, and the diary on January 8, 1753, when the forks of Muddy Creek were reached, reflects the same spirit: "The land on which we are now encamped seems to me to have been reserved by the Lord for the Brethren."[2]

Spangenberg's journey was followed in November of the same year, 1753, by the arrival of a party of fifteen from Pennsylvania, all but three of whom were to remain and form the first colony. Six of these were among the "200" being especially considered in this chapter. They had had a tedious six-weeks' journey through the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, but arrived with grateful hearts, assured that the Bible text for the day, Revelations 2:13, "I know where thou dwellest,"[3] was divinely intended for their encouragement. A love feast was held soon afterward, and a hymn composed for the occasion was sung:

> We hold arrival Lovefeast here, in Carolina land,
> A company of Brethren true, a little Pilgrim Band,
> Called by the Lord to be of those who through the whole world go,
> To bear Him witness everywhere, and naught but Jesus know.[4]

An industrious "town" was soon at work, with such skills as that of the tailor, Petersen, the baker, Merkle, the carpenters, Ingebretsen and Feldhausen, the gardener, Lung, and the shoe-

1. Fries, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, I, 44.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
3. John Henry Clewell, *History of Wachovia in North Carolina* (New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1902), p. 20.
4. Fries, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, I, 79.

maker and tanner, Pfeil, energetically applied. Life was not easy under primitive conditions, but devout hearts found abundant occasion for gratitude to God, as shown in the memorabilia for the year 1755:

> At the close of the year 1755 we poor sinners here in the Wachau have many spiritual and temporal blessings for which to give our humble, childlike, heartfelt thanks to our dear Saviour, our Heavenly Father and the Holy Spirit. We are grateful
>
> 1. For the daily consciousness of the presence of our gracious Lord and Saviour.
> 2. For the daily spiritual food provided by His word through our liturgies and other church services.
> 3. For the enjoyment fourteen times of the Holy Sacrament.
> 4. For the reading of the *Jüngerhaus Diarium*, and the *Gemein-Nachrichten* from Bethlehem, St. Thomas, etc.
> 5. For blessing in the use of our hymnbook, etc.
> 6. For fifty-six general and three special lovefeasts.
> 7. For sixteen Conferences, ten Unity Days, three Congregation Councils, two Pedalavia, and one Cup of Thanksgiving.
> 8. For our call of grace.
> 9. For the influence of the Holy Spirit in leading our poor souls to the Lamb of God.
> 10. For the blessing, assistance and protection graciously vouchsafed to us by our dear Heavenly Father here in the Wachau, and on the many journeys made by our brethren to and from Bethlehem, and in this province.

Then there follows a detailed list of the journeys, after that the success of trips of a legal nature to New Bern. There is gratitude for their sovereign, King George II, and consideration for the governor and Assembly. The new Carolinians are grateful for blessings upon their land and crops, for food and drink, even enough for 231 guests, for the blessing on their labor (with a list given of projects completed), and for the finding of a beautiful spring nearby. Finally,

> 17. For all not mentioned, part already forgotten, part beyond expression, for His goodness is immeasurable.[1]

This is a stirring and refreshing record of a people who were now, at last, making their finest and fullest contribution to the

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 120-122.

religious and economic life of the world. The fanaticism of Wetteravia had all but faded. The six single men who moved from Herrnhaag to Bethlehem and then to North Carolina were balanced by six others, apparently sane and tempered. Others under the wise guidance of Bishop Spangenberg (who once himself had hesitation about marrying) had their characteristic extremes mellowed by marriage. The old and the new were blended in America, as had happened so often, and even at Christiansbrunn (where the old single brethren's choir from Herrnhaag had its closest American counterpart) mystical emotions were held to moderation for the best of a generation by the demands of aily toil.

Dr. Adelaide Fries has a splendid summary of Moravian doctrine and religious practice in her *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, volume one, paragraphs from which will bring the above to suitable conclusion.

> It was preeminently a Christ-centered faith. The earthly life of Christ was followed from Anunciation to Ascension, the daily services taking their tone from the special days and seasons so made sacred. Of these seasons the events of His last week were oftenest in their minds. Not only were the Passion Week and Easter full of special services, but there was often a week in the fall given again to the consideration of the Passion story, and throughout the year a Passion Liturgy was used nearly every Friday evening, and whenever possible Saturday, or at least Saturday afternoon and evening were 'Sabbaths,' with rest from daily toil, and with appropriate services, usually a lovefeast and communion once a month.[1]

References to the body of Christ resting in the tomb show the underlying idea of the custom of observing Saturday as a day of rest, but they did not hesitate to postpone the Saturday services to Sunday when circumstances made this advisable.

> Their devotion to the person of Christ appears on every page of the Diary. His love for them and their love for Him; His sufferings and death for them, His mercy, His grace, His nearness, His kindness to them, were the theme of their daily meditation, and the Gospel which they preached to others, for while they had a vivid realization of Jesus Christ as their 'Chief Elder of the Unity of Brethren' there was nothing selfish in their religion, and they gladly told the story of the love of Jesus Christ to all who would hear.[2]

1. *Ibid.*, p. 200.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 201.

The Holy Spirit was regarded as that Person of the Trinity who cares for the souls of believers as a mother cares for her children, guiding, instructing, warning, reproving, comforting, most particularly pointing them to Jesus, their suffering Saviour, their Redeemer. Whitsunday and December 19 were especially dedicated to him, though there are many other references to his gracious work among them.

> God the Father was worshiped as the heavenly Father, taking care of His earthly children, protecting and directing them, and crowning with success the work of their hands. The Brethren also believed that the Father often used His angels in their service, and that through their agency otherwise fatal accidents were averted or minimized, and many attempts of the evil one to harm them were brought to naught.[1]

When Indian troubles were besetting the Bethabara settlement in 1756, the "Hourly Intercession" was instituted as it had been elsewhere in Moraviandom. From 4 A.M. daily until 11 P.M. some member of the Brethren's group was at prayer. Indeed, the diaries show an amazing amount of time given to religious meetings, witness thereto the following from 1770:

> *Sunday*: Three services in the morning,—Litany; Sermon; Reading of *Nachrichten*. Afternoon,—Bible reading. Evening,—8 o'clock, *Gemein Stunde*, consisting of a discourse on the Texts for the day. 9 o'clock, *Singstunde*. Following this was Evening Prayer for the whole congregation.
>
> *Monday*: Twilight,—*Rede*, that is the reading of a sermon written by some leading minister living elsewhere. Before retiring,—*Singstunde*. Evening prayer in the Choir Houses.
>
> *Tuesday*,—Twilight,—Liturgy. Before retiring; as Mon.
>
> *Wednesday*,—Twilight,—Bible reading. As Mon.; Evening Prayer for all.
>
> *Thursday*,—Same as Tuesday.
>
> *Friday*,—Twilight,—Bible Reading. Before retiring,—Liturgy, based on the Passion Hymn—'O Head so full of bruises, etc.'
>
> *Saturday*,—Meeting of *Stundenbeter*[2]. Before retiring,—*Singstunde*.[3]

---

1. *Ibid.*
2. These were the persons who participated in the Hourly Intercession.
3. Fries, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, I, 418.

This was a lighter schedule than in the earliest years, when midday services and morning prayer were likewise held daily. Also, in the summer months only one service (that before retiring) was held on Monday, Wednesday and Friday evenings. Then, during the weeks of harvest, the first service was eliminated, too, on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday.

> Of the *Singstunden*,—the song services,—it need only be said that the Brethren were a music-loving people. Various editions of their hymn books were printed during the days of the ancient Unitas Fratrum, and the renewed Unity continued the custom. More than a thousand hymns were in the books used by the Moravians in Wachovia; they were fond of congregational singing but varied it with solo and choir anthems; and by the close of the period now under consideration they had trumpets and French horns, trombones, flutes, and violins, in Bethabara, and used them from time to time in accompanying the voices.[1]

In connection with the latter it should be noted that as early as in 1744, Spangenberg had organized a *Collegium Musicum* in Bethlehem. By 1748 this group numbered fourteen, mostly single men and older boys. Undoubtedly the men resettled in America from Wetteravia brought musical gifts here along with

> Of theological discussion, as such, there is little record in the diary. Occasionally a visitor would ask concerning the doctrines of the Brethren, and they would answer his questions, and perhaps give him a copy of the Berlin Sermons of Count Zinzendorf to read, but apparently they did not permit themselves to be drawn into argument. The sermon outlines indicate a simple, clear exposition of Bible passages, intended to strengthen the faith of the Brethren, increase their trust in God, their love for the Saviour, and to impress upon them religion was a necessary part of practical, everyday life,—that a man could think of God while he cut wood, that any work, indeed, however menial was worthy work if done for Him. Their interpretation of the Gospel was meant to sweeten life, to make it earnest and happy; it was not a matter of definition to debate about.[2]

In summary, one could say that in Wachovia, as elsewhere in America, these people tried in simple, practical ways to make religion a part, the major part perhaps, of life from earliest

1. *Ibid.*, p. 202. 2. *Ibid.*

infancy to the grave. They did their best to try to realize what a Christian community should be. To put the matter eschatologically, they felt that the Kingdon of God is here. God was allowing them to live in its most advanced stage so far.

CHAPTER VII

THE GOSPEL AMONG AMERICAN INDIANS

On a quiet day in early September, 1773, a notable funeral was held in southeastern Ohio near the Beautiful Spring (in the German, *Schönbrunn*). It was notable because of the personalities involved, because of the locality where it took place, and because of the stage in American history that had then been reached. The day was quiet because it lay between two periods of turmoil. Not many years before, the British became sole owners of the eastern part of the United States, driving back the French and with them, their Indian allies in bitter conflict. Soon afterward, the smouldering fires of war broke out again, and the peace of Ohio was disturbed by the activities of both the English at Detroit and the Americans at Fort Pitt.

Schönbrunn was a Moravian Indian mission and is regarded as the first town in Ohio.[1] At its height it numbered three hundred inhabitants, mostly Delaware Indians, and was the most successful Indian mission established in America up to the close of the eighteenth century.[2] The first schoolhouse west of the Ohio River was located there, and the Rev. David Zeisberger, founder of Schönbrunn, was the first school teacher. Sixty houses of hewn timber were carefully placed to form a village with the shape of an inverted "T" and each house had a lot three rods wide and six rods long. A church forty by thirty-six feet was erected to seat three hundred persons, and a civil code of remarkable content was agreed on by the Indian inhabitants. These were gathered with their missionaries from former mission towns in Pennsylvania which they had been forced to vacate as the white man pushed the Indian farther and farther west.

---

1. See Joseph E. Weinland, *The Romantic Story of Schoenbrunn* (Dover, Ohio: Seibert Printing Co., 1930).
2. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

David Zeisberger conducted the simple rites referred to; one of the spectators was a relatively new Christian, Isaac, formerly known as Glikkikan; and the deceased was Anthony, a Delaware convert who had often preached the gospel and now, at age seventy-six, had laid down his eldership and his life, deeply loved and revered by his own people and mourned for by Zeisberger as though he had been his own brother.[1] The religious experience of the Moravian Indian is so well represented by Anthony and Isaac and is so much influenced by Zeisberger that it will be well to build this entire chapter around the lives of these three men.

Life of Zeisberger

Few men in any vocation have given themselves more wholeheartedly or more singlemindedly to their work than David Zeisberger. He was not a school man, he never attended a theological seminary, but for over sixty years he paddled his way along American and Canadian rivers, rode and walked along precarious Indian trails, slept out under the open sky—anything in order to seek out his beloved red men and to offer them the good news of salvation through the cross of Christ. And despite his lack of formal training he bequeathed to posterity hymnals translated for the Indians, religious tracts and a Delaware grammar. "As a missionary and an Indian linguist he is the peer of John Eliot, while he far outranks him as a herald of the Gospel and a forerunner of the race that has since possessed the land in which he labored."[2]

Adventure was in his blood from the earliest years. His parents, David and Rosina Zeisberger, left all their property and possessions in Zauchtenthal, Moravia, where David, Jr., was born, and then fled to Herrnhut. This was in 1726, when the lad was only five years old. After ten years they were among the colony chosen to go to Georgia with Bishop David Nitschmann. Because he had not yet finished school, young David

1. Edmund de Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1870), p. 389.
2. *Ibid.*, p. iii.

was left behind to complete his studies. Especially adept with Latin, he continued at his books even after being moved to Herrendyk, Holland, where he served as messenger boy for the Dowager Princess of Orange. But under the iron rule of the educational system then in force he was unhappy. After being beaten mercilessly with a rod for dishonesty, of which he was falsely accused, he and a companion decided to run away. Naturally it was to America that they determined to go, to be with their people. The following is indicative of the religious consciousness of the youth:

> From the day I left the Brethren in Holland to the day of my arrival in Georgia, the Lord graciously preserved me from all harm, in body and in soul. I was in great danger of being seduced to gross wickedness; but the Lord held His hand over me. At the time, I never realized this danger. Subsequently, however, it became plain to me, and I have often thanked my Saviour for His protection. Upon the whole, I see the finger of God in all that occurred; hence I can more readily forgive the Brethren in Holland the injustice which I suffered at their hands.[1]

In Georgia he received the training of an American pioneer and backwoodsman. Also, he fell under the influence of the great Peter Böhler, while the latter was preaching to Negro slaves near Savannah. The solid piety and disciplined energy of Böhler left an indelible mark on the learner-missionary. When the Moravians moved northward to Pennsylvania, David went along and was among the first settlers of both Nazareth and Bethlehem. Then, when he was to return to Europe with Zinzendorf's party in 1743, his unhappiness was noticed. Bishop Nitschmann, with understanding spirit, talked matters over with him and learned his fixed purpose: "I long to be truly converted to God, and to serve Him in this country."

A short time after this "Brother David" (as he calls himself in his diaries) felt the full "call," as a hymn treating of the love of God was sung in a meeting of the young man of Bethlehem. He says: "Its words pierced my heart like a two-edged sword. I burst into tears, left the table, and spent the whole afternoon in weeping and praying, until I found the peace of God which

1. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

passeth all understanding."[1] He went to the elders and declared his desire to preach to the aborigines, which he was permitted to do for fully sixty years!

What must be told of the Moravian Indian missions, of Zeisberger, of Anthony and of Isaac, does not make for a pretty picture in all its details. There are heroism and romance at every turn, but pathos and tragedy always follow at their heels. Again and again the Indians were settled in a promising corner of God's good earth, expecting a degree of permanence. Then they would have to push on, farther west or farther north. Each time they moved, Zeisberger and his associates planned the settlement carefully, new heights of spiritual triumph were reached, but then the clouds of adversity and persecution gathered and poured out their torrents of trouble.

The Early Indian Missions

While one of the avowed purposes of the Moravian colonization of Georgia was to establish an Indian mission, conditions never permitted a serious effort in that direction. The Creeks and Cherokees were reached later, but from 1735 to 1740 so much energy had to be expended on keeping the Savannah colony going that only a school for Indian children could be begun. Located five miles above Savannah, this school was the first Moravian effort among the Indians. However, when new centers of the Church were begun in Pennsylvania and New York, Spangenberg declared that the hour of grace had sounded for the Indian.[2]

The first Moravian specifically commissioned to do Indian work in America, Christian Henry Rauch, arrived in New York on July 16, 1740. He had a burning zeal to preach to the red men, but had no idea where he would find them or how he might begin; yet he was full of faith that God would assist him and lead the way. As he made inquiry, though, he received discouraging reports. He was told that efforts had been made to tame and Christianize the Indians, but it was hopeless. They still retained their sinful and barbarous ways, and were so drunken and dan-

1. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
2. J. T. Hamilton, *A History of the Moravian Church*, p. 22.

gerous that no white man could live among them.[1] Undaunted, he encountered two Mohicans ("wolves," in the Indian language), Shabash and Wasamapah. They were in the big city on a visit, having occasional sober hours between their rounds of the white man's "fire water." Their settlement, they told Rauch, was called Shekomeko, "the great clearing," and was up the North (Hudson) River and about twenty miles inland towards the east.[2] In the fleeting seasons of sobriety which dawned on their muddled minds, they accepted Rauch's offer to become the teacher of their tribe. But they rejected the offer again as soon as they were intoxicated and at last slunk away to their village without him. Never easily discouraged, Rauch followed them, asked his way from farm to farm and eventually found temporary domicile near them at the homestead of John Rau, a Palatine who consented to house him if he would in turn keep school for the family.[3]

De Cost Smith and others recount the story of Shekomeko and its filial stations more completely than can be done here. The white neighbors of the Moravian missionaries in Dutchess County, New York and adjacent Kent County, Connecticut, did not make things easier, though some of them attended services with the Indians. Eventually the Indian converts were transferred to new Moravian settlements in Pennsylvania, and Rauch went to Jamaica, where he served effectively as superintendent of the Moravian mission. The following account of Rauch's preaching, however, must be given because it goes to the heart of the matter. The spokesman is Wasamapah, Shekomeko's fourth convert and one of the two "wolves" met in New York by Rauch:

> Brethren, I have been a heathen, and have grown old among the heathen; therefore I know how the heathen think. Once a preacher came and began to explain that there was a God. We answered, 'Dost thou think us so ignorant as not to know that? Go to the place whence thou camest!' Then another preacher came and began to teach us, and to say, 'You must not steal, nor lie, nor get drunk, and

1. De Schweinitz, *Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 97f.
2. See de Cost Smith, *Martyrs of the Oblong and Little Nine* (Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1948).
3. De Schweinitz, *Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 98.

so forth.' We answered: 'Thou fool, dost thou think that we do not know that? Learn first thyself, and then teach the people to whom thou belongest, to leave off these things; for who steal or lie, or who are more drunken than thine own people?' And thus we dismissed him. After some time Brother Christian Henry Rauch came into my tent, and sat down by me. He spoke to me nearly as follows: 'I come to you in the name of the Lord of heaven and earth; He sends to let you know that He will make you happy and deliver you from this misery in which you lie at present. To this end He became a man and gave His life a ransom for man, and shed His blood for him.' When he had finished his discourse, he lay down upon a board, fatigued by the journey, and fell into a sound sleep. I then thought: 'What kind of a man is this? There he lies and sleeps; I might kill him and throw him out into the road, and who would regard it? But this gives him no concern.' However, I could not forget his words. They constantly recurred to my mind. Even when I was asleep, I dreamt of that blood which Christ shed for us. I found this to be something different from what I had ever heard, and I interpreted Christian Henry's words to the other Indians. Thus through the Grace of God, an awakening took place amongst us. I say, therefore, brethren, preach Christ our Saviour and His sufferings and death, if you will have your words to gain entrance amongst the heathen.[1]

This statement shows the rare courage and conviction of Rauch, who was only twenty-two years of age when he landed in America. But more than this, it shows that the preaching of a suffering Saviour made a deep impression on the Indian. Not always as savage as he is depicted, he was still crude in his ways. Life for him was rough and raw. He had to kill to eat, and the sight of blood and suffering was common to his experience. If his deep-seated sense of honesty and fair play were violated, he could go on the war path and destroy human flesh with tomahawk and slaughter. But as a rule, if not offered the white man's fire water, he was sensitive to good leading and discriminating in regard to new ideas. Rauch's message, then, conquered an otherwise reluctant heart. Wasamapah, who was baptized Job (sometimes spelled under German corruption,

1. J. Taylor Hamilton, *A History of the Missions of the Moravian Church* (Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Co., 1901), p. 24, 25.

Tschoop) was followed by a thousand and more red men from out of the forest of Pennsylvania and neighboring states. The message of the atonement of Christ conquered.

Actually, the Moravian efforts to evangelize the American Indian began long after others. In 1700 there were thirteen missionaries in the English colonies supported by the government, besides several who labored on their own account. At first, neither

> among the Mohawks nor the Oneidas, nor the tribes of New England, were the pious efforts of God's servants successful. An evil and corrupt generation met them. 'There is no hope of making them better,' reported Andrews (William Andrews, an English missionary who arrived in 1712) of the Mohawks after six years of toil and disappointments; 'heathen they are, and heathen they still must be.'[1]

These are strange sounding words, when one traces the Moravian efforts as far as to Schönbrunn, for when the Ohio missions reached their 1775 peak, it seemed within reasonable possibility that not only would the Delaware tribe eventually become completely evangelized, but other tribes would follow also.

> And as for the Jesuit Mission, its heroic days were past. The priests seldom induced their still numerous converts to lead even outwardly better lives. Baptized savages strutted among the unbaptized, decorating their persons with rosaries, as though they were strings of wampum, but were carnal and dissolute as before. Genuine conversions, manifested by a sober, righteous, and godly life, were rarely known. Hence the Indians had come to be regarded as brutish savages, whose salvation was hopeless.[2]

It is to the Moravians' everlasting credit that they ever kept optimistic about the Indian. They never shared a common American view, mentioned repeatedly by Smith,[3] that the Indians were "Canaanites" who must be driven out of the land.

---

1. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 104. Fortunately the British changed their minds about the Mohawks, for many of them were converted and joined the Church of England, even sending some of their chiefs to visit Queen Anne. A congregation of their descendants, using hymns in the Mohawk language, survive today in Brooklyn, New York.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 105. 3. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

Many of the colonists likened themselves to the Hebrews reaching the Promised Land and told by Yahweh to drive out the Canaanites and exterminate them root and branch.

While in this country, Count Zinzendorf made three excursions into Indian territory, one of them to Shekomeko. On another trip to Wyoming, Pennsylvania, his life was threatened by a hostile group of Shawnees, so his verdict concerning them was, "Let them alone."[1] But otherwise, much credit must be given the Count for making the arrangements that opened the way for the missionaries to live safely in Indian country. On the first of these excursions he met with representatives of the Six Nations and made a covenant with them at Tulpehocken, Pennsylvania. That was the occasion when he received from them a famous belt of wampum which he took to England and later passed on to Spangenberg, who brought it back to America and made important use of it. Pioneer work must always have an imaginative soul, a dreamer, to give it impetus. The Count was unequalled in his ability to serve in this capacity. Before he left Bethlehem he unfolded an extensive and systematic scheme for carrying on Indian work, much of which matured.[2]

Zinzendorf's strange ideas on the origin of the American Indian may be read in Reichel's book.[3] Like John Eliot and William Penn, he believed that they were a mixture of Scythians and Jews from the Ten Lost Tribes. A passage from Deuteronomy 28 was interpreted to account for the yellow hue in the Indians' skin, and certain linguistic similarities were also cited as evidence of connection between the Jews and the Indians. On matters of religion, more than of ethnology, his words should be noted.

> Therefore it is most plain to us that the Conversion of the Heathen must be of the same Kind as the Conversion among those that are already called Christians. And that all the Souls among the Heathen whom we shall admit to Baptism, must be awakened to eternal Life

1. *Ibid.*, p. 72.
2. Levering, *op. cit.*, p. 154.
3. W. C. Reichel, *Memorials of the Moravian Church* (Philadelphia, Pa.: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1870), pp. 18-22.

> by the Lord Jesus and his Spirit in like Manner as a person in Christendom who would be Converted must first be awaken'd. And therefore have we, in the Conversion of the Heathen, entirely rejected the Method of Teaching them such Matters as they can keep in their Head, and learn by Rote, to say after one. And a Heathen by our Way of Preaching or Instruction in heavenly Things, shall not be able so much as to talk when he has not the Matter in his Heart.[1]

This statement was not intended to refer to preaching only to the Indian, but to all prospective converts. But the heart of things is to preach the Saviour, not just belief in God in a general sense.

> But one may observe that the Mistake of all the Preachers that have been among these People consists in this, that they would convince them that there was a God; and have thereby made the poor Creatures either crafty or stupid. Had their teachers but once rightly read the Bible they wou'd have seen what Paul says in the first of the Romans, that there is no Heathen in all the World to whom it is not evident that there is a God.[2]

After Zinzendorf, of course, there were other visitors to Shekomeko, even after many of the Indians from that area had been removed. Conrad Weisser, the Lutheran justice of the peace and Indian interpreter, mentioned before, was there in 1743 and wrote of his experience as follows:

> The evidences of Divine Grace I observed in your Indians, their unaffected piety and their simple faith in Christ and his atonement impressed me deeply. As I saw their old men seated on rude benches and on the ground listening with decorous gravity and rapt attention to the words of Post, I fancied I saw before me a congregation of primitive Christians. John, who is truly a child of God, interpreted with demonstration of the spirit and of power.[3]

Six years later Bishop Cammerhof with Gottlieb Pezoldt journeyed to the stations beyond Shekomeko, Wechquadnach and Pachgatgoch. A manuscript extant at Bethlehem tells at length of their trials in travel, especially crossing the Hudson in late February, but even after a day of hard rain, the visitors were

1. *Ibid.*, p. 117. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 128, footnote.

cheerful, holding thoughts of soon seeing their brown *Herzeln.*[1] Having arrived, they said: "It is evident that our dear Lamb and dear Elder has awakened many hearts since the last absolution and communion.[2]

The language throughout this document is typical of the Sifting Time and reflects Cammerhof's strong influence. It stands in very real contrast to what will be cited later from the Zeisberger missions. Both groups emphasized the atonement and the importance of salvation through Christ's death on the cross, but in Zeisberger's emphasis the bloodier aspects were omitted. Indeed, even in this Cammerhof diary the words *Wunden* and *Seithölchen*, used so frequently, were scratched out by a later hand.[3] There is a quaintness about the young bishop's language that grows upon the reader if he is not offended by the expressions. For instance, Samuel's old blind mother at the summer settlement of Pachgatgoch was told that in heaven she would be given eyes by the Saviour so that she could see his wounds. The heart was referred to again and again and was usually drawn pictorially instead of spelled out. In Andrew's large hut Cammerhof preached to the Indians about the Lamb and his wounds, with burning-hot heart. Gideon's wife was assured that at last she would be allowed to be baptized in the blood of the dear Lamb. When resistance was struck and the unbaptized said: "We are not good enough; we are too evil to ask for baptism," the answer was: "His blood is sufficient."[4]

The excited zeal of Cammerhof led him to baptize considerable numbers of Indians who had been previously held off by the resident missionaries. This is in line with the Nitschmann and de Watteville policy noted before. Some candidates were baptized after a first interview with the bishop. An adolescent son of Luke, dying of consumption, was permitted the rite in all his weakness. Washkaschank came to understand the gospel better than previously, hearing Cammerhof, and now understood

1. Bishop Cammerhoff's Diary and Gottlieb Pezoldt's of their Journey to Wechquadnach and Pachgatgoch, from February 23 to March 22, 1749, MS, Bethlehem Archives. For use of term, *Herzeln*, see above, Chap. V.
2. *Ibid.*, Section C of M.S. 3. *Ibid.*, Section D.
4. *Ibid.*, Section D.

that he was not too evil or too wicked to be received by the Saviour. He heard that the Saviour does not expect us to make ourselves better, but will himself make us better through his blood. As for the women, apparently following Indian custom, they would usually wait to be baptized with their husbands, rather than take the lead in making their professions, even if "awakened" earlier.[1]

In Gideon's hut Cammerhof officiated in a service of baptism for four candidates, Missionary Bruce and the Indian, Jonah, serving as *dieners*. The service opened with the singing of some *Wunden* verses. Then Brother Cammerhof spoke of how by baptism the stream from the Saviour's side is poured over the poor Indians and thereby washes away all their sins. The dear Lamb was then asked to deliver them from all dark and hostile powers. Intercession to the Saviour was made, so that he might consecrate them forever. In hearty supplication the baptismal water was blessed to the Lamb and his wounds (*Pleura*). Then the four were baptized with Christian names: Gottlieb, Magdalena, Erdmuth, and Luke. Cammerhof officiated with the first three, Bezoldt with the last. The flood of blessing from all of this is reported as indescribably. All were affected deeply, and the "power of the blood"[2] could be seen in their many tears of love. Three Indian converts and the local missionary, David Bruce, joined the visitors in the laying on of hands, and the service was concluded. Later Abraham, an Indian, declared that there was a generally warm, happy and blessed feeling among all. Following the baptismal rite, a service was held for only the baptized members. This, along with individual "speakings" prepared the red men for holy communion. In the sort of objective realism characteristic of the Sifting influence, Cammerhof says that all gave testimony of how "hungry and thirsty they were for the Saviour's flesh and blood."[3]

Other pages of this diary manuscript point to a considerable revival of the Dutchess County mission during Cammerhof's stay. A fire had been kindled from above, he said, and no one

1. *Ibid.*, Section E.
2. *Ibid.*, Section F.
3. *Ibid.*

could hinder it.[1] However, one suspects that it was largely an emotional affair, comparable to some of the early twentieth century American revival campaigns. The extravagant language of Wetteravia flowed freely. Baptism was referred to as the "blood bath,"[2] and when the visitors left, the faithful gave them a juicy, loving kiss. One wonders what would have happened to Moravian missions among the Indians if this sort of influence had prevailed. In his four brief years in America, Cammerhof administered baptism to eight-nine Indians. Undoubtedly his approach had a strong appeal to certain Indian dispositions. But even these would need more than the flaming zeal of the evangelist to bring a new convert to fulness of Christian faith. Such a person was Anthony, to whom major attention must now be given.

Anthony—a Tested Servant of Christ

When the restoration of Schönbrunn was in progress in Ohio in 1927, one of the red letter days was March 12, when the cemetery was found. After less than four hours of digging, the first grave was discovered. It was that of Anthony, described as "the Mission's most valued assistant. From his death bed he delivered a testimony as bright as had been the daily testimony of his life."[3] This remarkable Delaware came from Tunkhannock, an Indian village about twenty-five miles from Wyalusing, Pennsylvania, a Moravian mission settlement. Years before Friedenshütten ("Tents of Peace") was founded at Wyalusing, however, Anthony visited Bethlehem. He was curious to find out what had happened to Nathanael, his brother, who had become a Christian some months before. At Bethlehem Anthony heard the gospel preached in all its appealing power. He, too, became a seeker and was baptized on February 8, 1750, by Bishop Cammerhof. He was by then in his early fifties, and his wife, Johanna, followed him into the Christian fold.[4]

---

1. *Ibid.*, Section H. 2. *Ibid.*, Section G.
3. Weinland, *op. cit.*, p. 23, following de Schweinitz.
4. *Catalogus derer von unsern Brüdern getauften Indianen des Nordlichen Theils von America*, compiled by John Ettwein, *et al*, 1742-1772, MS., Bethlehem Archives.

Anthony's first Moravian home was probably at another Friedenshütten, a modest Indian settlement adjacent to Bethlehem, along the Monocacy Creek. In these cabins and a "hotel" Indian visitors and refugees from New York and Connecticut were housed until Nain was built, a mile west of Bethlehem, along the Lehigh River. But Anthony did not stay in Bethlehem very long. On August 2, 1750 he was admitted to communion at Gnadenhütten ("Tents of Grace"), which was located up the Lehigh River from Bethlehem at the site of the present town of Lehighton.[1] As far as can be determined, he was still at Gnadenhütten on November 24, 1755, when a dreadful massacre of ten white missionaries and workers, and the capture of another took place.

The story of this bloody event has been told and retold, so will be repeated here but briefly. French-Indian scalping parties were quite common at the time, and none enjoyed a more evil reputation than the Munsees. As for the Moravians and their Indian settlements, they were always under suspicion. Endeavoring strenuously to be neutral in politics and non-combatants in war, they were suspected by the British of being in league with the Indians and French because of their missions, while the French were sure that, because of their proximity to Philadelphia, neutrality was only a cloak for support of the Crown. While sixteen workers, missionaries and missionaries' wives were at supper, then, on the west bank of the Lehigh at Gnadenhütten, attack was made. One of the victims opened the door when the barking of dogs announced intruders, and as he did so, there came a terrifying yell and a discharge of riffles. Through the smoke glared the faces of hideously painted savages. One of the missionaries was killed by the volley; a boy was wounded in the head. The rest made a dash for the loft, but before they could reach it five more were killed and a missionary's wife was dragged down, made a prisoner, and lived in misery among the Indians for some months thereafter before dying. Several of the group managed to escape by jumping out of a back window, but the rest died when the buildings were

1. Gnadenhütten Diary, MS., Bethlehem Archives.

fired and burned to the ground.

Zeisberger, strangely enough, reached the settlement by fording the Lehigh, just before the holocaust ended. He had ridden hard for several hours to give warning that the British militia were on the way to do harm.[1] Now that eleven martyrs fell in cold blood, the Brethren were able at last to prove to the British that suspicions of their being in league with the French were preposterous. Seeing that he could do nothing on the west side of the Lehigh, Zeisberger crossed over to the opposite shore where the Indians were living, and with Missionary Martin Mack helped to quiet the converts and demand that they retain their non-belligerent status and refrain from revenge. The next day, the Indians were brought to Bethlehem for safe haven, Anthony probably among them.

The Nain settlement being established soon afterward, Anthony and his wife, Johanna, were found there and remained as late as January, 1760. More favorable days ensued, so that many of the Indians could be settled above the Blue Mountains, some thirty miles from Bethlehem at a village called Wechquetank. Here the diaries have typical notations: In May of 1760 Anthony killed a beaver. The following January he conducted a religious service. In April of 1763 he carried a bushel of flour on his back from Nazareth. Later he went to Easton to sell a canoe for forty shillings; then he visited Nain. A week later the shingle roof of his cottage was blown away by a storm. Next, the diary says he showed particular interest in the printing of a Delaware hymnal.[2] All of this typifies the simple, domesticated life of the Christian Indian. He was happy in his new way of life, was satisfied that eventually all his brethren would see the light and give up their savage ways, and wanted nothing more than just to be left alone to make the difficult transition to a new way of life. But just this one thing seemed to be the impossible. All the love for the Saviour, which Anthony describes as his experience, while still at Wechquetank,[3] could not forestall events taking place outside.

---

1. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 146.
2. Diary of the Wechquetank mission, MS., Bethlehem Archives.
3. *Ibid.*, dated Oct. 30, 1763.

The spring of 1763 found Pontiac bent on driving the English into the sea. Delawares and Shawnees, Munsees and Nanticokes, Wyandots, Ottawas, Chippewas—perhaps a dozen different tribes were aroused to overrun Pennsylvania, even as far as the Delaware. The white population became terror-stricken and, as usual, were unable to discriminate between the intentions of the Christian and the war-mongering Indians. An unfortunate incident took place near Wechquetank, so that Anthony and his friends were no longer safe there. Along with seventy-seven Indians from Nain, Anthony and forty-three others from Wechquetank drew up a petition to Governor Hamilton, asking for safe keeping in Philadelphia. The request was granted, and so for sixteen months, until Pontiac's War was over, some of the finest fruits of Moravian Indian missions lived on Province Island.[1] During this time of stress, practical Anthony proved expert at finding oysters the diary shows. He defended the missionaries against unjust charges, functioned as elder and cooperated in disciplinary measures against some Mohicans in the party, and on July 20, 1764, carried his mother fully forty miles on his back![2]

De Cost Smith has high admiration for the Indians, their missionaries and the conduct of all concerned during the Philadelphia months. Dysentery and small pox wiped out nearly half their number. Repeated threats from well-meaning patriots like the Paxton Boys added extra pressure. But the heroic "captives" held fast.

> Better men than Christian Indians, if there be any better, might have sought to drown the memory of these depressing months in drink. It was a drinking age, and opportunity was not lacking, for the Paxton Boys, their recent enemies, no longer intent on killing them with hatchets, how extended the hand of friendship, and sought to sell them liquor. It was hard to resist, but the native leaders of the congregation and the missionaries were alive to the danger, and these strange pietists found no market for their wares.[3]

---

1. See de Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 403.
2. From Zeisberger's Diary of the Philadelphia period, MS., Bethlehem Archives.
3. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

The end of March, 1765, by official proclamation of the governor, found the Moravian Indians free men. Free to go where they might, free to begin life all over again, for they were now practically homeless, Anthony and the others turned once more to Zeisberger; and he was ready with a plan.

This time the locality for a new Christian Indian settlement was at Wyalusing, along the headwaters of the Susquehanna in upper Pennsylvania. Just before Pontiac's War broke out, Zeisberger, with the trusted Anthony as his companion, had visited Wyalusing and had some remarkable results in evangelizing the Indians of that place. Among the converts of this time was John Papunhank, a former false preacher who also went to Province Island. Zeisberger likewise had a famous white visitor to Wyalusing, John Woolman, who prayed when he left that " 'the great work' which Zeisberger had undertaken might be crowned with success."[1] The same name was given the new settlement as had been attached to the temporary Indian village of twenty years before, at Bethlehem, Friedenshütten. It became a veritable habitation of peace, at least for seven years, with gardens and fields laid out and many features added that caused praise for Zeisberger and his associates.

At Friedenshütten Anthony served regularly as one of Zeisberger's interpreters. He is pictured in the diaries as a staunch layman, having frequent conversations with visitors and members on spiritual matters. He also headed a delegation of Indians to a Synod at Bethlehem in which they delivered a belt of wampum and a written speech to be presented to the executive board of the Church in Europe, in the name of the Christian Indians. Friedenshütten, says de Schweinitz, must be looked upon as a wonderful instance of the civilizing power of missions.[2] It embraced twenty-nine log houses, with windows and chimneys, like the homesteads of the settlers, and thirteen huts, lined up neatly along one street, with a chapel and schoolhouse in the

1. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 271, with inner quotation from the *Friend's Review*, xvii, No. 29.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 316.

middle. There was poultry of every kind, and the converts had large herds of cattle and hogs. Trade was brisk, sanitary conditions quite advanced, and the hundred and fifty Christian Indians were seen to be contented.

For Anthony it might have been well to stay in the safety and "culture" of this village. But the church had broader plans. plans. Zeisberger was asked to make an exploratory trip to Senecas and Munsees in western Pennsylvania. The particular destination was Goschgoschunk, in the present Venango County. Anthony and Papunhank were drafted as his companions. It was new territory for a white man to be travelling, and Zeisberger was warned that the Indians at Goschgoschunk bore a wicked reputation. They used the blackest sort of sorcery, these Munsees who migrated from Wyalusing and Tioga. A friend of Papunhank's, however, lodged the three travellers, and by the light of a mid-October campfire, Zeisberger preached a famous sermon, with Anthony standing behind him.

A Philadelphia artist, Charles Schüssele, produced a notable oil painting of this impressive scene in 1862. The picture dominates the east wall of the Bethlehem archives building and has become a favorite of thousands who have seen it. Details of the scene are described as follows:

> It was at night. In the middle of the assembly burnt a large council-fire, whose flickering light fell with a ruddy glare upon the faces of the warriors, upturned in silent expectation to the white man who stood there, calm, collected,—ready to make known the glorious gospel. . . .The scene was ghost-like, until Zeisberger opened his mouth and began to proclaim the gospel. Then, although the utmost silence continued to pervade the assembly, the eloquence of his discourse. . .awakened unusual animation in the countenances before him; . . .there gleamed a strange light of wonder and enthusiasm from the dark eyes of the warriors. . . .Zeisberger ceased to speak; but the Indians wanted to hear more and so Papunhank. . . and Anthony arose and till late at night repeated what Zeisberger had said, with such explanations and illustrations as the Indians required. . . .A chief, Alsemewi by name appeared particularly moved, as also an aged woman of one hundred and twenty years who had been carried from the lower to the middle village, in order that she, too, might hear the words of peace. Zeisberger himself testified of this

occasion: 'Never, in any part of the Indian country, did I see such hellish fierceness depicted on the faces of the warriors; and then, when the Gospel had been preached, such an evident impression, on the same countenances of the power of God's word.'[1]

The painting was appropriately given the title, "The Power of the Gospel."

In the spring of 1768 Anthony, with his wife Johanna and two other couples, consented to settle with Zeisberger and another missionary on the Allegheny, half a mile from Goschgoschunk. Now in his seventies, Anthony made a real sacrifice to leave the eastern towns. But his was a strong voice against heathendom. Frequently he conducted private evangelistic conversations until midnight or later. On June 17, 1768, he conducted the evening service and urged: "It is not enough to listen willingly to the Saviour, but you should let the word which you hear come with power and truth into your hearts."[2] The Indians, like so many whites whom the Moravians observed back in Germany forty years before, were mentally convinced of the gospel's truth. They had to be moved in the heart. A few days later Anthony spoke out strongly against heathendom, preaching the Saviour and the atonement through his blood. Said he: "Why are you not then surprised that God, the Creator of heaven and earth, has come upon earth to shed his blood for us and has left his inheritance for us?"[3] To an Indian who claimed to have healing powers which he derived from God, Anthony said: "If you do not know the God of the cross, you have no God and know nothing about him.[4]

The work at Goschgoschunk was about as trying as anywhere that the Moravians preached, but fruits came forth gradually. Anthony was in part responsible for the conversion of Allemewi, the chief. With Wangomen, the local Indian preacher, he was not successful, nor was Zeisberger. The prize accession after

1. From a manuscript by Samuel H. Gapp, Jr., quoting Edmund de Schweinitz in *The Moravian* (1858), p. 401.
2. Zeisberger diaries, Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Box 135, Folder 1.
3. *Ibid.* 4. *Ibid.*

the mission was moved three miles to Lawunakhannek was Glikkikan, a captain and adviser to Chief Packanke, famous as a warrior and even more so for his eloquence. One day when Zeisberger came home from a visit to the plantation, he heard Anthony talking to this great captain "full speed ahead." He was preaching the Saviour to him with great enthusiasm. He said he did not have his happiness through dreams, as many Indians do. Revelations and visions through dreams they have;

> but I have just felt it in my heart by means of my own and by good sense; and I have come to know from that that it is not enough to hear the Word of God, but it must also be truly in the heart.[1]

Here was the first meeting of the three featured characters of this chapter: the intrepid Zeisberger, Anthony, who was something of an Andrew seeking out his brother, and Glikkikan, who by his unfailing courage and eloquent spokesmanship was a kind of Peter, prince of the Indian apostles. As the interview progressed, Zeisberger marvelled how Anthony was as eager to bring souls to Christ as a hunter's hound is eager to chase the deer. Ordinarily, simple man that he was, he would not have been able to sway the mighty Glikkikan, who at Venango had silenced the Jesuits and at Tuscarawas had defeated Frederick Post in religious debate. But the very Spirit of God seemed on his side that day, and Glikkikan admitted that all the words he had carefully prepared beforehand failed him.[2] Zeisberger's diary records it thus:

> 'My friends,' he said, 'hear me; I will tell you a great thing. God made the heavens, the earth, and all things that in them are. Nothing exists which God has not made.' Pausing a little, he continued, 'God has created us. But who of us knows his Creator? Not one! I tell you the truth, not one! For we have fallen away from God; we are polluted creatures; our minds are darkened by sin.' Here he sat down, and was silent a long time. Suddenly rising again, he exclaimed, 'That God, who made all things and created us, came into the world in the form and fashion of a man. Why did He thus

1. *Ibid.*, Box 135, Folder 3.
2. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 355.

> come into the world? Think of this!' He resumed after awhile: 'I will show you. God became a man, and took upon himself flesh and blood, in order that, as man, He might reconcile the world unto himself. By His bitter death on the Cross, he procured for us life and eternal salvation, redeeming us from sin, from death, and from the power of the devil.' In such apothegms he unfolded the whole gospel.[1]

This approach differs noticeably from that which converted Wasamapah at Shekomeko during the days of Rauch. It is surely a more "intellectual" appeal, for that was demanded for a man like Glikkikan. But the characteristic elements of man's sin, his need for salvation and the satisfying of that need in the cross are all present. Glikkikan was very attentive to all that was said, and the diary reports that one could see he was reflecting on it. Finally he said he was very happy that he had heard Anthony and that he could say nothing against it, for he believed it was the truth. He wanted to reflect on it further. For the present he could not say whether he wanted to become a believer or not.[2]

A few days later Glikkikan came back to the mission and said much to Anthony and to Abraham, another convert. He said he felt now that all his former preaching (he had been a "preacher" among the Indians but was no longer listened to), his ceremonials and the public worship in which he participated must be excused because he had not known better. But he said: "I have often called upon God and asked him if there were another and better way to happiness."[3] Now he believed that what the Brethren preached was the right and only way. He would make a prompt decision, meanwhile wondering why the Indians who had been at the mission for a year without making a decision delayed. A third interview between Glikkikan and Anthony was held shortly after this at Goschgoschunk, where the Christian Indians went for a council meeting. Glikkikan called Anthony aside and said that from now on he intended to give up his ceremonials and be faithful to the Saviour. It would take him more time than an ordinary Indian, however, because of his

1. *Ibid.*, p. 356.
2. Zeisberger diaries, Box 135, Folder 3.
3. *Ibid.*

status as a captain. Anthony answered him: "You must act according to your heart on this, and do as it seems good."[1] He wanted to say much more, that whoever would really like to be happy and hear the Word of God must put heathen things away from him and yield to the Saviour.

The balance of the story of Glikkikan (baptized Isaac) belongs below. Certainly his conversion is one of the stars in the crowns of both Zeisberger and Anthony. The latter lived for about five more years, always ready to preach and to supplement the words of his "white father." The mission was re-established twice more during his lifetime, once at Kaskaskunk, at the confluence of the Shenango and Mahoning Creeks (forming the Beaver River) in Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, and the other time at Schönbrunn. Late in 1770 at Langundo Utenunk (as Kaskaskunk was called in the Christian section), he told of the Saviour's birth on Christmas Day. Then, a quite old Indian[2] arrived for a visit, and "old faithful" retold to him the story of Jesus' birth and incarnation. Apparently the incarnation was never a neglected subject, no matter how much centrality was given to the cross. In August of 1771 inquirers came in large numbers, so Anthony spoke to a house full of visitors, assisted by other prominent converts.[3] The house was so full that several had to sit around outside. They listened eagerly as the Saviour was pictured in his earthly form and in his suffering. There was much ferment among them.

Later in that year a brave from Ohio arrived, one who had an evil reputation and had participated in the massacre at Gnadenhütten, Pennsylvania. He threatened to treat the Christians at Langundo Utenunk as he had treated the missionaries on the Lehigh. But Anthony lodged him in his house, showed him the whole mission and made such a deep impression on him that the brave almost asked for baptism. This last stout testimony combines with an event just two months before his death to give us a final picture of Anthony. He did nothing remarkable in 1772 or 1773 except that in the latter year, while living in Ohio at

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*, Box 137, Folder 1. 3. *Ibid.*, Box 137, Folder 2.

Schönbrunn, he stood as sponsor at the baptism of Johann Ludwig Roth, a missionary's son and first white child born in the state of Ohio.[1] Late in August, 1773, he contracted a "hot fever," and on September 5,

> the Mission lost Anthony, its most valued assistant. With lips eloquent even in death, he exhorted his countrymen to remain steadfast in the faith, and delivered a last testimony as bright as had been the daily testimony of his life. He passed away in the morning watches of the fifth of September, a patriarch of seventy-six years. Zeisberger mourned for him as for a brother.[2]

Schönbrunn had by now nearly reached its peak in religious productiveness and in its favorable reputation throughout the area. Thus, a peaceful natural death came as a great blessing to this faithful servant. He had been the victim of many persecutions, mockeries and removals. At least his death could come in peace. He was by no means a brilliant man, but typifies the better brand of Christian Indian who remained faithful to his first confession, accumulated stronger and stronger conviction that the way of Christ was the only way of salvation for his race, and actively, courageously advocated that way at every opportunity.

Indian Attitudes and Ideas

Before going forward with the life and experience of Isaac and a review of the development of Indian missions in Ohio and Canada, certain general matters concerning all Indians touched by the Moravians should be noted. Count Zinzendorf observed while visiting Shekomeko that the religious experience of the Mohicans was all the more remarkable because of the inadequacy of their language. He said:

> I confess that at times I felt pity for these poor people, whose imperfect language is inadequate for the expression of their new experiences, and of their views and wishes, as assistants in the Saviour's work. Our language is divine in comparison with theirs, and yet how unsatisfactorily can we give utterance to the emotions and aspirations of our hearts![3]

1. *Ibid.*, Box 137, Folder 3.
2. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger.* p. 389.
3. W. C. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

This does not mean to signify that the Indians were without religious ideas. They had ideas in abundance, but when they became Christian they needed new words for new emotions. That is one reason why it is fortunate that the Sifting Time expressions faded out, for in Cammerhof's time some of the extravagances in the German tongue were lifted right into the Indian vocabulary.

Like others, Zeisberger found, though, that the Indians had an elaborately developed cosmogony. According to the saying of some old Iroquois, the natives originally lived in the interior of the earth. A badger burrowed his way to the surface, and was so pleased with the land he there found that he hastened back to report his discovery. Thereupon they came forth from their subterranean abode and took possession of this new country.

> Others asserted that there existed in the heavens a world of men and animals. From that a pregnant woman was hurled down to the earth by her enraged husband, who had detected her faithlessness. She gave birth to twins, through whom the earth was peopled.
>
> The legend of the Nanticokes was equally trivial. Several Indians, men and women, they said, had suddenly found themselves sitting on the sea-shore. Whence they had come, whether they had crossed the waters, or been created in America, they could not tell. From these the whole race was descended.[1]

Some vague notions of the Deluge which Zeisberger met seem to have been a mixture of Algonquin traditions touching their great manitou, Manaboyho, and of Iroquois sayings with regard to the origin of the earth. The earth, he was told, having been submerged, several human beings, among them two or three women, saved themselves on the back of a turtle, who had reached so great an age that his shell bore moss. These requested a loon, who happened to cross their path, to look for land. He complied, diving to the depths of the waters, but found none. At last he flew far away, and returned with a small quantity of earth in his bill. Guided by him, the turtle swam to the place, where a little spot of dry land was seen, on which the survivors

1. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 218.

settled and repeopled the world. Hence the illustrious position of the Turtle clan, into which incidentally Zeisberger was officially adopted, along with being adopted into the Onondagas of the Six Nations.[1] On their ideas of cosmogony, the Moravian missionaries did not bother to try to correct the Indians. Their main interest was Christ and him crucified. Other considerations could follow as they might.

Reasons for Reluctance

Whatever problems came to the missionaries because of the Indian language limitations or because of their primitive cosmogony, their high sense of honor always appealed. Because he was an "honest Injun" and possessed such a lofty sense of honor, the redskin would make an unflinching disciple of Christ, once he was converted. Some became apostate, but perhaps few in comparison to the white Christians. When, in the early 1780's there was a cruel massacre of Christian Indians in Ohio, all the Delaware nation was aroused. The non-Christians might have looked down upon their fellows who had confessed Christ beforehand, but now that they were so treacherously dealt with, every honorable red heart was aroused. Smith offers in full detail a conversation between Captain Wingenund, chief of the Delawares, and Colonel Crawford, a sly American who joined himself to the "patriots" responsible for the massacre. The conversation is concluded:

> The blood of the innocent Moravians, more than half of them women and children, cruelly and wantonly murdered calls aloud for *revenge*. The relatives of the slain, who are among us, cry out and stand ready for *revenge*. The nation to which they belonged will have revenge. The Shawnees, our grandchildren, have asked for your fellow prisoner; on him they will take *revenge*. All the nations connected with us cry out *Revenge*! *revenge*! The Moravians whom you went to destroy having fled, instead of avenging their brethren, the offence has become national, and the nation itself is bound to take Revenge![2]

1. *Ibid.*, p. 78.
2. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

In this same conversation Wingenund speaks of how constantly the unbelieving Indians had told their Christian friends they would be betrayed by and by. They had had sufficient dealings with other white men to convince them that the Indians sense of honor would never be matched by the whites, though for a short time it might seem proper for the redmen to adopt the Christian faith.

This basis for reluctance in asking for Christian baptism is matched by others, the diaries show. A Shenango chief, for instance, came to Schönbrunn and was much impressed with the witness of his fellow-Indians. He heard them assert their conviction of the truth of the gospel, but replied:

> Yes, white people truly believe that; and it may be quite true for their persons; but it has happened to us Indians quite differently. White people see things according to their white skin; we are brown, so we must be content to remain very miserable, hiding our great need from view. They live in beautiful houses, but we must stay in crude huts and spend most of our time in the woods, hunting. In their houses they have many beautiful things: silver and silvery vessels. We scarcely have pots in which to prepare food. They have come from far away, across the great Sea. But God created us here and gave us this land to possess. Moreover, just look at the creatures, how different they are in the water, as well as on land; one animal is a stag; another a bear; another the foxes or the wolves; and birds of different kinds. Then there are the fish, and he leaned toward the other (Isaac) and said: even so there is a great difference between Indians and white people. From this you can surely see that God distinguishes us from each other and has made us different from the whites.[1]

The idea that the gospel was just for the whites was hard to combat. In 1773 there was progress made toward Christianizing some of the Shawnees, among them Echpalawehund, a noted and influential chief. But when some of the Shawnee council realized that his going from the Indians to live with the Christians would prompt others to follow, they hesitated. They mustered new confidence that their own religion was adequate, though the chief had his doubts and knew neutrality was not possible. Nevertheless, the decision was made to wait. Acceptance might

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 137, Folder 3.

be given eventually, but for the time being the Shawnees felt they wanted the missionaries to stay away.[1]

Fear about making a full renunciation kept a number of the higher brand of Indians from becoming Christian. Since the missionaries insisted on the converts' coming to live in separate villages, away from their pagan relatives and neighbors, this meant that a chief or captain had to surrender his lofty office. This was no mean sacrifice. Isaac made the sacrifice, but a chief at Goschachgunk (Coshocton), Ohio, declined. He was convinced that Christianity is true, but what would he do with his office as chief?[2]

Then there is perhaps the noblest and most notable example of one "almost persuaded," White Eyes. A famous Delaware, a Miami chief and first warrior captain of that tribe, his fame was rehearsed wherever the fires of their lodges burned. White Eyes had many contacts with the Moravian Indians and was quite fond of Isaac. At a council meeting he made a strong plea for the cause which he had not joined:

> It would be good if all Indians became believers. You see, they lead an orderly and quiet life. They do no one any harm and live peacefully with everyone. For that reason, if all Indians lived that way, they would be a peaceable and fortunate people, and would not have to be in constant fear of attack. One doesn't hear of theft, lies and cheating among them; nor little of drinking, murder, homicide and the like. But all these matters and many more are common among the other Indians. Therefore, no one can say with truth that their cause is not right. It is right and will remain right. There are now quite a few against it, but let twenty years come around, and we will see by then what a great number of Indians there will be who believe; and in fifty years there will be few who do not believe in this area.[3]

This is one of the most impressive apologetics spoken for Christianity in any age by a neutral. How is it that neither White Eyes nor the chief to whom he made the statement was baptized? For the chief, the reason given was that he felt he had sinned too much, so that he could never be accepted as a believer. This

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 141, Folder 3.
2. *Ibid.*, Folder 8. 3. *Ibid.*, Folder 5.

was always a hard attitude to combat. As for White Eyes, he defected from the Moravian cause and suddenly journeyed to Philadelphia, apparently seeking some other denomination to work among his tribe. Zeisberger believed he hoped by this arrangement to get some special place of honor that he would not have with the Moravians, or he may have been looking for a more progressive policy that would have brought the Indians a mechanized civilization.[1] When White Eyes failed in his Philadelphia errand, whatever it was, it meant cutting himself off from the confidence of both his Moravian friends and his fellow non-believing Indians. A great victory for the gospel would have been gained had he been baptized.

The problems and failures of the Indian mission, therefore, were many. The fierceness of the Indian when intoxicated is so well known that it need not be discussed in any detail. As early as the time when he travelled to Lake Canandaigua with Bishop Cammerhof, Zeisberger had to resolve on a precarious strategy in the face of bands of drunken Indians. The record of this particular trip[2] contains weird scenes of virtually impossible escape from horrible savages. At Langundo Utenunk the arrival of two drunken Indians caused all sorts of trouble too, but Anthony and others succeeded in calming them and warding off their threats.[3] Isaac went still further and early in his Christian career rebuked Chief Packanke for his drinking. The chief was sick, and so Isaac instructed him concerning the Saviour, reminding him that sometime before he had promised to live completely for Christ. This caused the drunken Packanke to give vent to a very angry speech, to which Isaac listened quietly, then said: "When will you stop drinking?" Packanke said that he had stopped yesterday. Then Isaac said to him: "That is just why I asked, for you are talking now like a drunken person, and not as it becomes a man who would be at his best."[4] Words like these took courage to speak, especially to one's superior in rank.

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 147, Folder 2.
2. See de Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 167ff.
3. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 137, Folder 2.
4. *Ibid.*

There seems to be little doubt but what the Indian's shame about his drinking, after he became sober, often led him to be more receptive to the gospel than he would have been otherwise. Wasamapah is just one example of the changed man made possible through the gospel. Others, though, were observed as early as the time of Cammerhof.

> 'What have you done to our brothers,' said the indignant warriors (of Wyoming County, Pennsylvania), crowding around the bishop, 'that they are so entirely different from us, and from what they used to be? What is this baptism which has made them turn from our feasts and dances, and shun all our ways?' Cammerhoff's response was a fervent discourse upon the atonement of Christ.[1]

Zeisberger, as has been noted, modified the Wetteravian method of teaching, but he still retained a strong emphasis on the atonement. It was the basic element in man's salvation to be continually stressed, no matter how many practical problems and elementary needs of the Indian the missionaries tried to satisfy. When asked about his method of teaching, Zeisberger made it plain.

> The Word of the Cross is the sole means by which the hearts of the heathen can be converted; and all experiences in this mission field have sufficiently substantiated this. Our method of teaching is to address ourselves in all simplicity to the hearts of the Indians, and often to repeat to them, that grace and freedom from all sin are to be found alone in the sacrifice offered by Jesus for the whole world.[2]

From this, one would gather that the method was an objective presentation of the atonement, much as Zinzendorf had used, except during the extremes of the Wetteravian period. The Indian was living in a stage of development where concrete, objective images spoke volumes, whereas metaphysical language or debate would never reach him.

Isaac, Prince of the Converts

The year 1770, when Glikkikan was converted and baptized as Isaac, marked the high tide of the Moravian mission. It was

1. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 159.
2. Weinland, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

at this point, as well as during the bright days at Schönbrunn, that Zeisberger felt some of the greatest confidence of his life. In his diary he says: "The preaching of the Gospel begins to cause a stir among the Indians. . . .Now is the mouth of the enemy stopped."[1] De Schweinitz says:

> The power of the heathen party was broken, through the unexpected defection of Glikkikan, and the persecutions, from which the Mission had so long suffered, came to an end. As the converts had accepted the offer of Packanke, and were about to withdraw from Lawunakhannek, Wangomen invited them, and their teachers, to a farewell-council, at which he proposed that they should part as friends, and apologized for the two attempts which had been made, by his young people, to take Zeisberger's life. In reply, Zeisberger forgave all the injuries which he had endured while among the tribe, and once more earnestly appealed to them to turn to the living God.[2]

It was a picturesque sight on April 17, 1770, when the Christian Indians left Lawunakhannek in fifteen canoes. As they approached Goschgoschunk, its inhabitants came down to the bank to see them pass. Quite unexpectedly to all, a solitary canoe put off and joined them. It contained Gendaskund and his family. Here was another worthy addition to the Christian cause, a man who with Glikkikan was baptized the following Christmas Eve. The place was Langundo Utenunk, the westernmost locality of Moravian mission work in Pennsylvania.

At the end of two years both this latter mission and that at Wyalusing, Pennsylvania, (Friedensstadt and Friedenshütten) were moved to a track of land favored by Zeisberger near the junction of the Tuscarawas and Muskingum Rivers in Ohio. The reason seems to have been that, because of the increasing encroachment of the whites, Zeisberger thought it would be better to have the Indians in more open and undisputed country. Near to their unbaptized Delaware brethren under Chief Netawates (Newcomer), the Christian Delawares were settled at Schönbrunn and the Mohicans at Gnadenhütten, about nine miles away.

---

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 135, Folder 3.
2. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 359.

Here in this favorable environment, rendered difficult only by the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, Isaac spent five happy years. It was a time of great service on his part in behalf of both the mission and the white missionaries. The Delawares had officially invited Zeisberger to establish missions on some of their land, but adversaries among their number occasionally had doubts about the procedure, hence the need for a champion of the gospel with the gifts of Isaac. The following, delivered to the Grand Council meeting at Woaketammeki, is typical of his statesmanship:

> We believing Indians in the two towns below and above the Gekelemukpechünk Creek, in Schönbrunn and Gnadenhütten, first of all give hearty thanks that for about two years we have been allowed to live there in peace and tranquility, where you designated and where we hope to enjoy being longer. Also, we cannot help acquainting you with the evidence about it which the leaders in Philadelphia gave when they permitted us to leave in peace, after they held us for a year and a half in their protection. All kindness was shown, and we were supplied with food and clothing. Afterwards, when peace was again restored, they spoke to us in these words: 'Go in peace to your friends and to your nation. We will look after you, to see where you go, and wish you good fortune on your journey. But because we knew you accepted the Word of God, which you hear gladly, you would perhaps not willingly go without your teachers, if you ponder on it. So you should know that your teachers shall have freedom to go with you. You should, however, regard them as your flesh and blood, as you have. Thus they will experience that if things go well for you, it will go well for them too. If you suffer hunger, they will suffer with you; and everything will have to be put up with. But be fond of them (love them), for we give them to you as a mark of our love toward you. They will not fail to preach the Gospel to you wherever you go.'[1]

Then Isaac mentioned specifically Zeisberger at Schönbrunn and Schmick at Gnadenhütten as men to be accepted as one of them, that is, the Delawares. "Look upon them as you do us, for we and they are one body; and what you do to them, do also to us."

Here is not only a statesmanlike speech, Indian oratory at its best, but it is also a noble demonstration of the absolute loyalty

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 141, Folder 5.

which came to the missionaries by and by from their most devoted converts. Years later Isaac realized from a demonstration in July, 1781, that the lives of missionaries were in danger, especially at New Schönbrunn. He rebuked his unbaptized brothers who had plans to kill, and vowed that ever would the Christians take care to protect those who had brought them the "good news."[1] On another occasion Isaac performed a like function of mediation toward a band of roving outsiders who could not seem to understand why the Christians were living separately from the other Indians at Goschachgunk. With a peace offering of tobacco and a string of wampum, they made clear that real faith could qualify one for admission to the community (Salem, Ohio).[2] Satisfied, the intruders left, and the mission was again spared embarrassment.

The spiritual ripening of Isaac was a gradual process. His baptism did not occur until sixteen months after his speech at Lawunakhannek, when he indicated that he was convinced of the truth of the gospel. Then it was another sixteen months before he was admitted to holy communion. Zeisberger's method was surely to build up to an emotional peak at the time of one's first participation in the sacrament. Isaac and Jacob (Gendas' kund) he found hardly able to wait to be baptized when he talked to them. He explained that their great aspiration would be satisfied shortly, when they would be buried in the death of Jesus through baptism, amid a mighty lamentation of grace, by the Holy Spirit.[3] Visitors came to witness the ceremony, about fifty being present in all, and "many tears were dropped in Christ's lap." Though the communion sacrament was withheld sixteen more months, Isaac began immediately to tell others about Jesus. He told an aged Indian how glad he was that the man had come to visit and said he should surely hear "the sweet words of the Saviour." The costliest foods of the world, said Isaac, are not to be compared with these.

Around the time of his first communion, he went with Zeisberger among the Shawnees. There they heard a statement by

1. *Ibid.*, Box 148, Folder 1. 2. *Ibid.*
3. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 137, Folder 1.

one of the Shawnee preachers of great interest to them because Isaac had similarly "preached" before his conversion. Isaac recalled that he had told the Indians not to drink, dance, commit adultery, steal, lie or cheat. Thereby, said he, we will remain steadfast until something else, something better is shown to us in one way or another. Issac said he had not been a stubborn preacher, unyielding in his opinion, should something better come. But then it came! He heard the Brethren for the first time, and the Word of God, about Jesus' suffering and death, charmed his heart, so that he openly confessed that it is true.[1] The climax of Isaac's words to the Shawnees, then, was bearing witness that the gain from Christ's death and blood is the only sure ground for our happiness. The Shawnee preacher yielded and asked for a Christian preacher to come and settle with them.[2]

As time went by, Isaac became bolder and bolder in his preaching. He was always in the vanguard of the mission's efforts, going out to dangerous tribes like the Shawnees and Munsees. To the Munsee Chief, Anindamowougan, he said:

> What do you think of the great fact that God the Creator of all things became man for our sakes and was willing to be wounded over all his body because of our sins? And then, so full of wounds, he was nailed hand and foot to a cross, on which he shed all his blood, so that we should not be lost in our sins. Whoever believes this with his whole heart will attain forgiveness of his sins and have bestowed on him eternal life and happiness.[3]

Anindamowougan, an enemy of Christianity, answered: "You here are altogether mislead and are the slaves of the white people." Isaac said to him: "You will, therefore, not believe it; so you will die in your sins and be lost and will some day have to acknowledge with regret that Isaac said that to you. You are still a chief and think yourself to be wise, and yet you are so imprudent." The directness and graphic language used by Isaac here represent a new kind of approach to the Indian. Even Zeisberger had never before rebuked a chief so roundly.

---

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 141, Folder 2.
2. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, (p. 383) says this town was called by the traders "Vomit Town," because its inhabitants had been dupes of that doctrine which made emetics the means of salvation.
3. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 137, Folder 3.

The continuing failure of White Eyes to request baptism and enter into full fellowship with the Christians was a source of great disappointment to Isaac. On a visit to his too long neutral friend, in connection with negotiations mentioned before (to give the missionaries standing like their Indian converts and not like that of undesirable whites), Isaac said:

> 'Brother, you remember our ancient friendship. We formed a covenant of lifelong friendship and mutual love. We placed our tobacco pouch between us, that each might take from it at will. We agreed that whoever would find in this world special knowledge or insight concerning eternal life and the way to happiness should make it known to the other so we could both have a share in it.
>
> 'I wish to redeem that promise. I come to testify to you that I have found this way. I have heard and accepted the blessed Word of God which is preached here. I have found what avails for eternal life and happiness, so now I want you to have a share in it too. That you will have, if you will now accept.'
>
> Tears fell down the cheeks of White Eyes, and he said: 'Yes, it is the truth, which you are saying. I believe that here the true and only way to happiness is preached. I have already thought much about it and have still not forgotten what I first heard in Langundo Utenunk. I always go over it so that I may come to believe it.[1]

White Eyes died of smallpox four years later, still unbaptized, but de Schweinitz feels that no unbaptized native, of any tribe or name, did so much for the mission and for the gospel.[2]

As for Isaac, his courageous witness continued unabated. At Goschachgunk he faced a hostile Indian named Gulpikamen and answered his presumption on the subject of Indian ancestry. Gulpikamen retreated before his incomparable foe, as had many others. The dramatic power and oratorical skill of Isaac must have been superb. Whereupon, Isaac preached about Christ's merits and sufferings, by which alone the Indians can be happy. He told them that they would never find anything that would make them happy except the blood of Jesus Christ, shed for Gulpikamen and for the sins of the whole world.[3] The emphasis on the power of the atonement to bring happiness is sig-

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 141, Folder 5.
2. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 470.
3. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 147, Folder 3.

nificant. To Isaac, there was no joy or lasting peace for anyone, except he find, first of all, assurance of his sin's being forgiven. The gain from this assurance was a happy heart, fully at peace with God and man. Too many of the German Pietists lacked the element of a happy heart in their Christian experience. Perhaps it came from a certain "mystical" twist to Moravianism that the Pietists did not cultivate. At least there is a resemblance in the Moravianism of that time to the rapture that mystics have described in other ages.

The method of evangelization was not all formal address by any means. Often there would be personal interviews, like that in February, 1772, with a Shenango chief, that lasted all night. Perhaps there was something mystical about the night hours that caused the Indians to enjoy talking about religion then. Or by talking all night on a subject they may have underscored its importance. The conversation with the chief dealt with life after death and was prompted by a Christian funeral held that day. Isaac was asked what Christians believe about spirits, where they go at the end. Did the Christians agree with the Indians that all spirits come at the end to one place, not going either to God nor to the Evil One? Isaac answered:

> That is certainly blindness on the part of the Indians. They know nothing, understand nothing and yet always appear to be wise. There is never anyone out of the gathering of spirits who falls prey to sin, as you say. The way you describe it, one might think you had really seen it yourselves. You content yourselves with open, foolish and silly lies and concern yourselves no further as to whether it is really true or not. One tells another, and no one establishes a sound basis for things.
>
> I will gladly tell you the truth. You can depend on it that the faithful immediately after this life will go to live with the Saviour, over whom Satan has no power, for they have found forgiveness of their sins in the Saviour's blood and are thereby made blessed. But the unbelievers do not come to the Saviour. Where there place is, I don't just know; but I do know that they come to no good place and will once have to appear with fear before Him. Then he will give them over to the Devil, who has been their Lord here, and with him will cast them into everlasting fire. This, I know, is the truth.[1]

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 137, Folder 3.

Another night interview of Isaac's was with a former colleague who had years ago spent whole nights with him in drinking and festivities. They had not slept a wink then, so the colleague said: "That being so, let us spend just one night over this great matter, and talk it out with each other." Isaac agreed and remained through the night watch, answering questions about the way of salvation until morning, then they both went home.[1]

Never does this great Indian apostle give the impression of self-pity or indicate that he felt he had made a rare sacrifice. He was sure that in Christ all believers have the victory, and he enjoyed that conviction in special measure. This came out one day when a "seeker" spoke of Isaac's having formerly been a captain of his tribe. He asked: "How can you reconcile your now being a believer with having been a captain?" The answer was:

> Yes, before this I was a captain, but I always felt defeated. My sins ever prevailed over me. A good captain ought never to feel defeated, but always be victorious and conquer. I know that very well, for I had often intended to punish myself no more. But I could not let go and had to be Satan's slave.
>
> Now, however, I am for the first time a good captain, for now I can conquer all the time. Sin can no longer overpower me as before, for I can no longer enjoy looking at your amusements. I no longer have any pleasure in them, for I have found what is better. That I wish also for you.[2]

The Indian answered: "You speak correctly; that is the truth." Another who came with him said to Isaac: "You have concluded well." This agreement, which so often followed Isaac's words, demonstrates how entirely reasonable he was able to make the gospel as he presented it to his own brown brothers. Moreover, what he said above about conquering as a Christian is ever so wholesome. If his attitude can be said to be a remote refinement of German Pietism, thoroughly altered in a new land and among a new race, is it not a genuine, attractive and affirmative Pietism?

---

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 147, Folder 5.
2. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 137, Folder 3.

Little more need be said, in summary, about his character and gifts. Zeisberger appreciated him deeply, as is indicated by words spoken on June 6, 1773, saying: "He was baptized with the brain and heart of a white minister."[1] He was ever firm toward the Indians who needed to hear a strong defense of the gospel. But he was compassionate before all who needed sympathy. This was shown when he rescued an eighty-six-year-old man whom the Shawnees aimed to burn. He gave the man good care and received proper payment in terms of the man's pathetically strong appreciation.[2] Love for the Saviour was unquestionably Isaac's continuing power of motivation. About a year before his death he suffered from intense pain in his ear. His head became so swollen that one could hardly recognize him. Nevertheless, he could scarcely keep quiet. Wingenund being present on a visit, Isaac told of the love of the Saviour toward a poor sinner.[3] Another time Diarist Jungmann says that the great Indian apostle came to him in tears, having seen a picture in his room (mystically?) of Christ born, bound and crucified—for him! "Oh, if only I could love him: that is my longing and my plea to Him!" And then, demonstrating joy for what had come to Isaac, the missionary answered: "One should have Him perceptibly near at all times, in one's eyes and heart."[4] Few red men felt they knew the Saviour as intimately as did this "prince" of them all. The reality of Isaac's faith was soon to be tested, when he and four-score other Indian brethren experienced a violent death.

Last Days of the Mission: End of the Zeisberger Era

The solid character of the Schönbrunn mission is attested to by the following statutes agreed upon by the Christian Indians. It is called by Weinland "Ohio's First Civil Code."

> 1. We will know no other God but the one only true God, who made us and all creatures, and came into this world in order to save sinners; to Him alone we will pray.

1. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 141, Folder 4.
2. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 147, Folder 10.
3. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 148, Folder 1.
4. MS., Bethlehem Archives, Box 144, Folder 6.

2. We will rest from work on the Lord's Day, and attend public service.

3. We will honor father and mother, and when they grow old and needy we will do for them what we can.

4. No person shall get leave to dwell with us until our teachers have given their consent and the helpers (native assistants) have examined them.

5. We will have nothing to do with thieves, murderers, whoremongers, adulterers, or drunkards.

6. We will not take part in dances, sacrifices, heathenish festivals or games.

7. We will use no tshapiet, or witchcraft, when hunting.

8. We renounce and abhor all tricks, lies and deceits of Satan.

9. We will be obedient to our teachers and to the helpers who are appointed to preserve order in our meetings in the towns and fields.

10. We will not be idle, nor scold, nor beat one another, nor tell lies.

11. Whoever injures the property of his neighbor shall make restitution.

12. A man shall have but one wife—shall love her and provide for her and his children. A woman shall have but one husband, be obedient to him, care for her children, and be cleanly in all things.

13. We will not admit rum or any other intoxicating liquor into our towns. If strangers or traders bring intoxicating liquor, the helpers shall take it from them, and not restore it until the owners are ready to leave the place.

14. No one shall contract debts with traders, or receive goods to sell for traders, unless the helpers give their consent.

15. Whoever goes hunting, or on a journey, shall inform the minister or stewards.

16. Young persons shall not marry without the consent of their parents and the minister.

17. Whenever the stewards or helpers appoint a time to make fences or to perform other work for the public good, we will assist and do as we are bid.

18. Whenever corn is needed to entertain strangers, or sugar for Love Feasts, we will freely contribute from our stores.[1]

One thing that appeals in this code is the comparatively large place given to the native assistants. One can imagine how effectively Anthony served, and even more so, Isaac, in this capacity. Democracy was being born among a race regarded by many as incapable of it.

---

1. Weinland, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

> On occasions of extraordinary importance, such as the removal of the Mission to a new locality, the decision was invariably left to a vote of the people. But, from one point of view, perhaps the most remarkable feature of these towns will appear in this, that they were centers of agriculture and not a collection of hunting-lodges. The chase was by no means abandoned, but it had become a secondary object. To raise grain, cattle, and poultry formed the principal employment of the converts. Their plantations covered hundreds of acres along the rich bottoms of the valley; herds, more numerous than the West had ever seen, roamed through the forests or were pastured in their meadows; while few farm-yards of Pennsylvania had fowls in greater variety. Men of judgment and distinction, coming from the Eastern Colonies, were often filled with astonishment when they here beheld Indians not only civilized, but changed in all their habits and growing rich.[1]

When the Delawares moved their capital to Goschachgunk, they modelled their town after Schönbrunn.

The outbreak of the Revolutionary War disturbed all this, however. Incited by the British at Detroit, the Iroquois, the Ottawas, Shawnees, and Wyandots all went on the warpath and mocked the Delawares for not joining them. White Eyes and other Delaware leaders, however, kept their tribe neutral for several years, inspired, surely, by Zeisberger and many of the Christian Indians. Both Zeisberger and Samuel Kirkland, who secured the neutrality of the Oneidas and Tuscaroras in the East, are credited with great service to the colonial cause by keeping Indian tribes from joining the British. But this did not save the mission. Because of danger from either the British or from misinformed Americans, the missions at both Schönbrunn and Gnadenhütten were evacuated and the Indians transferred to a third settlement, Lichtenau, which was just two and a half miles from the Delaware capital. This eased the tension for a short time, but when large numbers of the Delawares began to go over to the British, Colonel Brodhead brought the rest of their tribe to Fort Pitt for American protection. The Moravians refused to go along and thus exposed themselves to the whims of the British and of the hostile Indians. Their verdict was to

1. De Schweinitz, *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, p. 424.

drag the suspected neutrals to the upper Sandusky, where starvation and separation from their missionaries plunged the Indians, Isaac among them, into deep gloom. Eventually the missionaries were released, after trial at Detroit, but the horrors of winter far away from their home and crops defy description. The cold was intense and their rude cabins offered no defense against it. Cattle, as expected, died of starvation, infants for lack of mother's milk.[1]

March came, and with it memories of the corn standing unharvested in the fields of Schönbrunn and Gnadenhütten. Since friendly treatment by the Americans could be expected, a large number of men, women and children started on their long journey to the old settlement to retrieve much needed food. Arriving after the backbone of winter had been broken, they fell to work gladly, husking, shelling and sacking the grain to be carried back to their starving kindred. War parties, however, were going and coming all the time, and border raids by wildcat groups of both whites and Indians put everyone under suspicion. When the crop was nearly gathered in and the Christian Indians were already preparing to leave, a party of four Wyandots camped for the night near Gnadenhütten. They were hurrying back from the Ohio, where they had killed a number of white people, including a woman and child whose bodies they had left impaled. Knowing that the indignation of the settlers would be thoroughly aroused by the atrocious incident and that they would be followed, they counseled the Christians to leave at once. Trusting up to the end and knowing themselves innocent, these remained instead, and the bitter consequences followed.

Two hundred white men, Americans from the Ohio near Wheeling, arrived shortly, led by Colonel David Williamson. They rounded up all the converts from the fields, stripped them of all their arms and tools and told them they were to be killed.

> This decision had been reached by a kind of vote. The men had been paraded in line and those not in favor of the proposed slaughter were told to advance one step out of rank. To their everlasting

1. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

> credit sixteen or eighteen of them did so; others, we are told, in an effort at apology more damning than extenuating, would have done the same, had they dared face the scorn of their comrades. Also it has been said that 'Colonel' Williamson himself disapproved of the plan, but lacked sufficient control of his 'militia' to prevent it, neither of which explanations tends in the slightest degree to wipe out the disgrace.[1]

In the morning two "slaughter-houses" were designated, one for the women and small children, the other for the men and boys. A cooper's mallet and other sharp tools were used to bludgeon the innocents. Having finished the ghastly butchery, the "militia" set fire to the charnel houses, and rode off whooping towards Schönbrunn no doubt in the belief that they had left no living witness of their villainy. But two boys, one of whom hid under a trapdoor and the other who recovered from an apparently fatal blow, escaped to bear the bitter news to the upper Sandusky. At Gnadenhütten is a tall shaft inscribed:

HERE
TRIUMPHED IN DEATH
NINETY
CHRISTIAN INDIANS
MARCH 8, 1782

The noble Isaac, Glikkikan, was among them.

> Theodore Roosevelt with his characteristic emphasis says: 'More than a hundred years have passed since this deed of revolting brutality; but even now a just man's blood boils in his veins at the remembrance. It is impossible not to regret that fate failed to send some strong war party of savages across the path of these inhuman cowards, to inflict on them the punishment they so richly deserved. We know that a few of them were afterwards killed by the Indians, it is a matter of keen regret that any escaped.[2]

From this dreadful blow the Moravian mission to the Indians never recovered. Zeisberger lived for twenty-six more years, comforting and exhorting the converts who remained with him and reaching out to Chippewas settled at New Gnadenhütten, Michigan. Settlements were founded, too, at Pilgerruh, Cuya-

1. *Ibid.*, p. 224. 2. Weinland, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

hoga County, Ohio, at New Salem on the Petquotting, and finally at Fairfield, on the Thames River, Ontario, Canada. Actually the Delaware nation disintegrated after the death of White Eyes and Netawatwes, but had it survived, it is a question whether the primitive minds, so often abused and so constantly moved hither and yon, could ever again have consented to adopt the "white man's faith."

Mistakes in policy and procedure were surely made with too great frequency over the period of Indian missions here reviewed. Most of the catastrophes that developed, however, are probably better accounted for by the pressures of war. The Moravian missionaries strove valiantly to share the good experience of Jesus Christ, which they had had, with the portion of humanity, near at hand, that seemed to need it most. But impossible odds prevented further fruit during the decades following 1782. Today the only living remnant of missions to the American Indians on the part of the Moravians is a band of eighty-nine Ramona Indians residing in southern California.

The following list of principles, called "Method of Converting the Wild Indian," serves to remind the reader of what the religious experience was that the Moravians sought to convey to the Indians.

1. Daily walk and prayer.
2. Singing and prayer in the presence of the Indians.
3. The Lamb of God.
4. Who is He? He was slain as a sacrifice for us.
5. The depravity of man.
6. Man's redemption.
7. The Lamb of God became a Man for our good.
8. Prayer for the heathen.
9. Christ is addressed in prayer as the Creator of the world.
10. Explanations adapted to their comprehension.
11. Personal conversation when desired; but not too much of it.
12. Dwell on man's evil heart of sin and unbelief.
13. Spiritual and physical death.
14. The resurrection-call out of hell and out of the earth.
15. The heart's desire for Gospel truth; and its indifference and unbelief.
16. Desire is changed into love.

17. Love is sustained by hope.
18. The sacraments.
19. Baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.
20. Explanations, if called for.
21. The Son has created, redeemed and sanctified all who come to Him. That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, etc. (Philippians ii, 10, 11, etc.)
22. Looking for the revelation of the Trinity to the heart and mind by the Holy Ghost
23. Prayer to Jesus, the Lamb slain, as our Lord, God blessed forever, the everlasting Father, etc. (Isa. ix, 6).
24. The Trinity, spoken of as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and His Holy Spirit.
25. The Divine Being, on whom all things depend, and to whom all things tend is Jesus, the Lamb, the Saviour.[1]

Here again are the typical marks of Moravianism in the eighteenth century: the Pietistic stress on inner examination, emphasis on the redemption offered in Christ, and the focussing of attention on the Saviour in all his offices. Like the white man, the Indian was invited to accept a Christ-centered faith in loving gratitude to God, and not just to avoid the punishment of hell. Also, like the white man, he was appealed to for a response from the heart, reasonable though the Christian faith was made by its messengers.

---

1. F. F. Hagen, *Old Landmarks* (Bethlehem, Pa.: published by the author, 1886), pp. 210, 211.

CHAPTER VIII

SIGNIFICANCE AND CONTINUING INFLUENCE

Now that the Moravian experience of 1740-1770 has been described in reference to its leaders, its common people and its Indian converts, there remains the task of interpretation and evaluation. A measure of interpretation has been given as each earlier subject was discussed. Now there needs to be a more general evaluation in terms not only of past significance but of continuing validity. History is fascinating in itself, but what does it teach?

This chapter divides itself into four main subjects: exactly what the experiences of the colonial Moravians was, what consequences it brought about at the time, how the denomination has drawn on the original impulse for its continuing vitality, and what this experience has to say, if anything, to the Christian world today. The first is rather easy, because the patterns are consistent. If Baron von Hügel[1] is correct that the three essential qualities belonging to the full and corporate Christian life are the institutional, the intellectual and the mystical, the Moravian must be classified in the colonial period as mystical, despite all the difficulties this term involves. It is clear that, according to the standards of the second generation at Halle, the Moravians were not mystical enough to be accepted as Pietists.[2] But with the regularly accepted Pietists, they were anti-rational. Their lack of interest in theological debate was not due to intellectual laziness. Nor was it a sign of rare agreeability. It was simply indicative of their belief that experience, not reason and ideas, is of primary import.

The anti-rationalists insist that they are not irrational. It is just that to them the way of empirical knowledge is primary. There is truth in sensation that is above the truth in ideas. Here the Moravians stand on common ground with the Metho-

1. Von Hügel, *op. cit.*, 2 vols.
2. *Uttendörfer, op. cit.*, p. 32.

dists. For Wesley, too, the heart of faith is immediate knowledge, not in the mystic sense of union with God, but in the empirical sense of personal awareness of the operation of God in life and human history.[1] It is an evangelical type of piety that is cultivated, with its instinct for homely colloquy with God, for the preaching of the Word, for simple converse and spiritual exercises in company with likeminded souls.[2]

Another mark of the Moravian experience was a contemplation of the cross of Christ and a devotion to it as the symbol of man's salvation accomplished. Vivid preaching of Christ's suffering and death was part of the trend of the times (cf. Jonathan Edwards), but the Moravians heightened the trend. Not only Christ's cross, but his blood, his wounds—even his wounded side—all become familiar terms for representing the operation of grace and the redemption of man. The death of Jesus has crushed evil, has brought forgiveness and demonstrates that the kingdom has come.[3] This has a striking affinity with the modern emphasis on realized eschatology. It is a central part of the thinking of those theologians[4] who stress that the Event has occurred.

Various Moravian publications have defined the essence of Moravianism as an emphasis on the Christian life in general. This should be sharpened to say that it is on the Christian life as the ongoing experience of Christ's loving sacrifice of himself on the cross. The Indians realized that this was the emphasis, and they recognized that it was different from what their other teachers, perhaps Lutheran and Reformed[5], had given them. It stemmed from Zinzendorf's desire for the experience of the concretely present Saviour.[6] During these years of revival the

---

1. See H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Kingdom of God in America* (Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1937), p. 106.
2. See Addison, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
3. See Albert Schweitzer, *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, translated by William Montgomery, London: A. and C. Black, 1931, p. 63.
4. E. g. John Knox.
5. Hagen, *op. cit.*, p. 237.
6. See Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

Saviour's presence was felt, and it was his suffering that furnished an example for his followers who were also called upon to suffer.

It is difficult to improve on the term, "heart religion," for this experience. Setting the emotions afire, it took command of the will. It claimed the lifelong loyalty of David Zeisberger, systematic, practical and hard-headed. But when it operated on him as a young man, it caused tears to run down his cheeks. This sort of thing is hard for the typically unemotional Anglo-Saxon to understand, but it was so much a part of the initial experience of these people that its validity is difficult to doubt. Men of deep thought and sober judgment, like Spangenberg and Böhler or the Indian Glikkikan, were overpowered by it. And again and again, one member of the fellowship or the other said he was brought to newness of life by a conviction of the truth *in his heart.* "How do I know it?" they would say. "I feel it inwardly, in my heart. Yes, I feel in my innermost being that the Word of God is compassion, and his Son's suffering and death are true. The great God is moved to compassion so that I may be able to believe his Word."[1] Zinzendorf's known fondness for the Fourth Gospel is easily explained. John is the Gospel of Christian experience; it is the Gospel that speaks to the heart.

The fact that the Moravian experience is introvert and personal while, at the same time, a group experience is interesting. A man like Spangenberg could easily have been lost to the outward cause of the kingdom of God if he had not formed a strong attachment to some organism like the Unity. Not everyone will live through the agonizing hours that Spangenberg lived through before finding peace in Christ. But finding that personal peace was not enough. With it Spangenberg very nearly became a separatist, a celibate and an unfruitful recluse. Pietism could offer him an outlet for his introvert tendencies in missionary work or in home service at an orphanage, but he needed something more. He needed to be surrounded with the love and the fellowship of others who were bound by a like discipline. The Moravian system provided that. It made him part of a group

1. Supplement to Fairfield Diary, MS., Bethlehem Archives.

that shared their experiences. Heart spoke to heart, and while the choir meetings were for common edification, individual needs were considered. Personal interviews and heart-searching brought peace and assurance, especially before holy communion or at the hour of death.[1] The encouragement of the group was given to the man with a problem: drinking,[2] or whatever it was.

If the Moravians, as above indicated, stood in a kind of midway between Pietism and Methodism, perhaps here was their true uniqueness: meeting the needs of individuals. The Christian Church is caught painfully short at this point today. Mass revivals are for the most part passe; the congregational prayer meeting is seldom vital. Is it possible that a modified form of the choir system, with small groups concerned with the problems of its members, is a need of the hour? Except in the Wetteravian era and under the influence of de Watteville and Cammerhof, the Moravians did not strive for numbers. Controlled strictly from their European headquarters, they leaned over backwards to avoid proselytizing and preferred to attach many of their converts by a sort of "American Diaspora." In Europe they had been afraid of the tensions developing from competition with the state churches. This gave them a small church outlook and in its worst guise made the members feel they were the spiritually elite. Yet it gave the Moravians opportunity also to pay attention to personal needs and to foster the group life. Within the community, both whites and Indians were provided protection from the outside world, where dancing, gaming and drunkenness prevailed. A haven was offered where the "saints" could be separate, quiet and undisturbed. Right conduct could be enforced, and heathendom was shunned. The Bible was the main literature; calls to prayer were frequent. An added value of the communal, separate life was that children could safely be left behind in its security when missionary parents had to go to far-away places.

1. See the memoir of Christian Schwarz, MS., Bethlehem Archives.
2. See the memoir of Johann Georg Baumgarten, Salem Archives.

It was in connection with the communal life of the Moravians, of course, that they set their ethical standards. Nearly every community had its Brotherly Agreement, which defined the basis of their communal living and stated its moral demands clearly and specifically. There was no pressure to squeeze anyone into standards he did not approve. Before uniting with the congregation, the prospective member or convert was fully aware of what was expected of him.[1] Community life was certainly not always idyllic. Some people[2] were hard to live with; bad tempers persevered in spite of the soul's conversion. Discipline had to be exercised, and drunkenness occurred all too often. And yet the general moral level of Moravian life was regarded by outsiders as high. If, as Uttendörfer claims[3], orthodoxy was failing to raise ethics in the eighteenth century, the Moravians were judged by people like Franklin to be succeeding at this point. One of the tests of religion must always be its impact on morality.[4] The Moravians surely did not transform the whole American countryside by the ethics of their closed communities. Many looked upon them as queer and narrowminded, but their quiet and peaceable life bore a subtle testimony.

One of the strongest elements in this colonial religious experience was the Moravian ability to communicate. Their preaching was pictorial and simple, so that children could take hold of it, and savages, unable to understand their foreign tongue or render the same ideas exactly in their own language, could grasp it. Here the gifts of Zinzendorf were striking. When he spoke of the humility of Jesus, he called him "the dirty little child in tattered begging clothes."[5] All abstraction was removed in language so vivid and direct. Again, when he challenged workers who were to serve Christ and the Moravian cause, he said: "Serve as if you were iron and steel; love like a sick heart."[6] This sort of

---

1. See above pp. 19, 242, 243.
2. E. g. Johann Georg Baumgarten; see his memoir, Salem Archives.
3. Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
4. Cf. the statement made by Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen that today we witness the strange phenomenon of more church members than ever before in America, while also suffering from a lower morality. Associated Press release, November 25, 1954.
5. Bettermann, *op. cit.*, p. 51. 6. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

thing registered with people. It had a ring of reality, so that both the Count and his associates swayed large numbers with the enthusiastic tone of their preaching.

The colonial Moravian experience, then, was enthusiastic, antirationalistic, emotional, revivalistic and introvert. It derived its motivation from contemplation of the Man on the cross. At the same time, it possessed a well-starched ethic, found expression in a vast missionary enterprise, nerved its members to rare faithfulness in their day-to-day work, built a fellowship that sang its way into the frontier wilderness, and thereby was communicated to others in a fashion that can well be the envy of any age that is trying to tell people what the gospel of Jesus Christ is saying.

Results of the Experience in the Eighteenth Century

The effects of this experience were notable at the time, both inwardly and outwardly. For one thing, the Moravians were gripped by a sense of the intimate presence of the Saviour. Whereas for the Calvinist and Lutheran there was always an interval of respect between man and God, to the Moravians, God in Christ was so near that he could be called Elder Brother. Prayers were offered to Jesus as frequently as to the Father. This made God seem very near as Saviour, and no problem seemed too small to bring before him. If any one had met a Moravian brother in early Bethlehem or Bethabara, or a Moravian Indian at Schönbrunn and asked him: "Does the divine meet you on the level of your personal concerns?"[1] he would have received an enthusiastically affirmative reply. God was so close that he would speak on even a trivial matter, if the lot were consulted. By the latter means, a good principle was carried too far.

Now there is an illuminating comparison between the American Awakening of the nineteenth century and earlier Moravianism at the point of the relationship between the Bible and religious experience. Whereas during the Awakening there was an effort to validate the Scriptures and make them historically contem-

1. Cf. James, *op. cit.*, p. 491.

temporary by the subjective means of religious experience[1], among the Moravians this worked in reverse.

> They declared that the famous words, 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' must be taken in a free and broad way. They held that, though the Bible was inspired, it contained mistakes in detail; that the teaching of St. James was in flat contradiction to the teaching of St. Paul; and that even the Apostles sometimes made a wrong application of the prophecies. To them the value of the Bible consisted, not in its supposed infallibility, but in its appeal to their hearts. 'The Bible,' they declared, 'is a never-failing spring for the heart; and the one thing that authenticates the truth of its message is the fact that what is said in the book is confirmed by the experience of the heart.'[2]

There are Moravian writers who would say Hutton goes too far in this statement, but certainly there was a drift in the direction of making experience normative. On the other hand, Bishop Gapp quotes Zinzendorf as saying that not ecstasy, but Bible reading, shows the way to a true knowledge of God. Therefore we can not deal with a causal comprehension of God, only with God manifested in the flesh.[3] Actually, the Moravians exalted the practice of Bible reading, but not so much in order to find objective criteria for living as to come into the presence of Christ, whom they regarded as the whole (the *olon*) of Scripture. In this further sense, then experience is normative. The Bible is far more valuable than other devotional books[4], but its value must be appropriated by a devotional approach to its contents.

As far as the communal system is concerned, values are easy to find, at least of a temporary nature. It proved to be an excellent system for getting economic life started in the New World. The Moravians were mostly of a German stock that was highly skilled in crafts and trades. As their products were offered to the outside world, a profitable trade was established, and the profits could be applied to community betterment and to

1. See Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
2. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 264.
3. S. H. Gapp, Sr., *op. cit.*, p. 6.
4. See Uttendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

support of missionary endeavor. There seems to be little question but what the missionary work on such a large scale would have been impossible except for the communal plan. The plan produced a thriftiness among the Moravians that puts to shame the stewardship of many other Americans. Before anyone should declare these people abnormal, their habits and achievements would have to be weighed carefully. It would probably be discovered that their habits of thrift and industry and their ability to establish themselves on new ground are of the very stuff that created the backbone of America.

The system suited the temperament of many who lived under it. One man declared that when he arrived he found "the people to whom I belong and with whom I shall dwell and remain."[1] It brought a man daily encouragement to live with dozens of others who held the same ideals and faith. It was thrilling to be part of a movement that was establishing a solid colonial settlement and at the same time carrying the gospel to needy souls. Each person had a sense of belonging, and a man like Spangenberg could make everyone feel that he was making a valuable contribution to the total program. As for difficulties with the Indians and other neighbors, they discovered that a careful guarding of their reputation and practical piety was their best insurance. Changing circumstances, however, made it imperative that the communal system be abandoned. Individuals wanted to own their own property. They were anxious to obtain voting franchise, and they wanted to promote more normal family life.[2] According, the common economy graduated into life in a closed town and then into a typical American community where any could come to live who chose. The source of the plan was unquestionably Spener and his *ecclesiolae*. The development of it was part of the genius of the generation here being studied.

Pietism generally had the tendency to shun art, science and secular culture.[3] The evidence that the Moravians were an ex-

1. Memoir of Christoph Merkle, MS., Salem Archives.
2. Fries, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, I, 302.
3. See Paul Grünberg, "Pietism," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1928), I,X 64.

ception is not too plentiful, except that they loved music and fostered it. Music formed a large share of their recreation. They played the works of the German masters, but had no hesitation to compose their own. Most of their compositions were sacred, gathering around the Passion theme, familiarly, but some secular music was composed and played too. This is such a large subject in itself, along with the hymn composition of Count Zinzendorf, his son, Christel, John Cennick, Louisa von Hayn and others, that it can be noted only in passing that music was prominent in the settlements and came into full flower around 1800. Meanwhile, other embellishments not quite in keeping with strict Pietistic principles were freely introduced by the Moravians. A surplice for the minister officiating at baptism and holy communion was introduced in the 1740's, although the ancient Unity had discarded robes as popish and despite the protest of some men like Henry Antes. Candle services were introduced in the colonial period as suitable symbol of Christ, the Light of the World. An artistic taste was not lacking, therefore; and there was no prejudice against music in the church or other simple embellishments which offended people like the Mennonites.

As for the Indian villages, it would appear that for internal reasons the settlement plan was sound. The new converts needed the isolation from their background that was provided by separate living. De Cost Smith concludes that for the Ohio region, though, the Moravians brought a degree of civilization for which the lawless area was not yet ready.[1] Who knows what the results of missionary work among the Indians would have been without the disruptive intervention of war?

Unquestionably the most notable consequence of this religious experience was the personal and group witness given. Moravian missions had their inception in Europe, at Herrnhut, but the American church did not fall behind in furnishing its full share of recruits. Note has already been taken[2] of how many of the emigrants from Herrnhaag went into missionary work. One of Count Zinzendorf's truly great achievements was his channelling

1. De Cost Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 183. 2. Above, p. 178.

the zeal of so many persons into fruitful areas of service, whereas less skillful handling of them would have sent many of them into the devious paths of separatism. As it was, Bethlehem in 1742 could say that of its population of 203 persons, 59 were out in the home and foreign mission fields, 72 were living as permanent inhabitants, and the other 72 were "pilgrims" in the community for a rest before taking a new assignment abroad.[1] There were 100 horses in the possession of the Brethren at Bethlehem, used by pilgrims who rode horseback through the country. By 1747 they had spread themselves out into nine of the thirteen colonies and had fully thirty-one preaching places. Two years later Bishop de Watteville wrote a hymn for the first home mission love feast of the Philadelphia First Church and listed eighty-seven centers of gospel activity in this country. Peter Böhler was able to say around the same time that a Brother on foot or on horseback could travel in a radius of four hundred miles from Bethlehem and spend every night in a Moravian home.[2] This kind of personal witness and laymen's responsibility for preaching the gospel prevailed for two more generations, as testified to by the life of Gottlieb Schober, a gifted North Carolinian who died in 1838.[3]

As for foreign missions, they are always ranked as the Moravians' largest single contribution to Christian progress.[4] Gripped by the message of a Saviour who died for them on the cross, these people had just one desire: to share that message with others. The more savage and backward the races, the greater the challenge. Not only is the scope of Moravian missionary effort from 1740 to 1770 impressive in itself, but there is also the influence which the Brethren's example cast on others. These heard of evangelistic efforts begun in the West Indies in 1732; in Greenland in 1733; in Surinam (Dutch Guiana), 1735; Labrador, 1752; South Africa, 1737; Persia, 1747; Ceylon, 1740; Kalmuck Tartars, 1768; China, 1742; Tranquebar, 1775; Algiers, 1741;

---

1. S. H. Gapp, Sr., *op. cit.*, p. 2. 2. *Ibid.*
3. Memoir of Gottlieb Schober, MS. in possession of the family.
4. Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 403, quotes R. Jenks, *The Moravian Brethren in North Wales*, as citing three specific services of the early Moravians: congregational music, missions and emphasis on education.

Guinea, 1737; Egypt, 1752; Lapland, 1734; and the Samoyedes on the Arctic shore, 1738—quite an imposing array! Some of these fields were abandoned for reasons of climate, high mortality among missionaries for for other reasons. Not all of them had recruits from America, but the high missionary fervor was characteristic of all the Church during the era.

It is true also that not all of the missionary efforts were regarded with any great measure of success, even though continued. Ettwein indicated disappointment with some results among the American Indians.[1] By the year 1800 much of the Indian work had dwindled noticeably. But this does not alter the reality of the experience that began missions. Whereas Pietism itself ultimately failed, among other reasons, for lack of adequate organization,[2] Moravian missions continued to flourish. Today the work in South Africa, in the West Indies and in Surinam still prospers, along with certain other fields established later than the period now under survey.

A by-product of the missionary endeavor was repeated suffering, hardhsip and often death. Had not the Saviour suffered and given his life for sinful man? His servants, called by grace, should be willing likewise to suffer. Spangenberg specifically mentions this as the motive for his willing, yet ascetic sacrifice.[3] Travel conditions being as dangerous as they were, the suffering on this account by Spangenberg, Zinzendorf, Cammerhof and Zeisberger can hardly be exaggerated. What befell the white missionary very often became the lot of his convert. Thus, Anthony was forced to change his residence a dozen times, according to the fortunes of the Indian mission, and conditions did not improve after his death. Bishop Ettwein sacrificed so much for the cause that he was unable to pay the passage to bring his daughter over to America for twenty-seven years! Finally, there was the bitter price of suffering which the Moravians had to pay because of their unrelenting neutrality in the face of war. Back in the early days of the Unitas Fratrum Peter

1. K. G. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
2. See Waterhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
3. G. Reichel, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

Chelcicky ardently denounced war of any kind. How painfully his spiritual descendants paid for following in his footsteps!

For the sake of completeness, just a word should be said here concerning Wetteravianism and its consequences in America. The word may be brief since the subject has already been considered quite often. Those who have studied religious experience of many varieties[1] say that over-beliefs are indispensable to the total cause. For this reason one is shocked but not too surprised at some of the language of Zinzendorf and Cammerhof. Actually few of the Moravian leaders were as sentimental and sensuous in their expressions as these. John Ettwein, for instance, was thoroughly exposed to Herrnhaag and its ways from 1743 to 1747, yet it was he who was asked by the synod of 1789 to delete the offensive Sifting Time phraseology from the American Church records. Absoluteness in religion, as witnessed by young Christel, leads to fanaticism. But as Knox points out,[2] splendid achievements by the enthusiasts are found side by side with their fantastic eccentricities. And from a neutral, Wallace, comes the verdict that Moravians were the least fanatical of the Germans in Pennsylvania at this time.[3]

Let it be remembered that the Wetteravian Era was one of aggressive evangelism both in America and in Europe, producing the Moravian Diaspora work in Europe.[4] It was the time also of the complete elaboration of the choir system. The fixing of customs such as candle services at Christmas time (used even by the Indians!) began then and endure to the present. And from the pen of one of the mystical extremists, Louisa von Hayn, comes the favorite hymn of many contemporary Moravians. The first stanza is translated:

---

1. James, *op. cit.*, p. 515.
2. Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 416.
3. Wallace, *op. cit.*, p. 116.
4. Fries, *A Brief History of the Moravian Church*, p. 52.

Jesus makes my heart rejoice,
I'm His sheep and know His voice;
He's a Shepherd kind and gracious,
And His pastures are delicious;
Constant love to me He shows,
Yea, my very name He knows.

Thus, out of the chaff considerable good grain has been sifted.

Finally, there were the effects of this colonial experience on others. Newbigin, in an impressive message for our day concerning ecumenical co-operation,[1] emphasizes that the test of the Spirit in a small group is its ability to work with others. It has been demonstrated above that Spangenberg was the most successful Moravian leader in this area in the early days. There were those who were drawn to the Moravians, and then there were many who were noticeably hostile. Calvinists almost everywhere opposed them because of their refusal to enter into doctrinal debate, and were especially sure they were in error in their view of free grace.[2] To Spangenberg, anyone who had faith and walked with Jesus was his brother in the Church, regardless of doctrinal interpretations. As far as the Indians were concerned, tribal barriers were broken down by the gospel, and as was noted in the previous chapter, such credit is given the Moravians for keeping the Delawares neutral and thus paving the way for victories for the colonies.

Among other religious groups it is difficult to say just how much the Moravians were an influence. In Saxony, the Schwenkfelder were most content to live on the Zinzendorf estate, side by side with the Moravians. But in Pennsylvania the ties became looser and looser, particularly after Spangenberg left their number. Even the Pennsylvania Synods, which began so auspiciously, did not cement permanent ties between the Moravians and the Schwenkfelder or other of their neighbors. It was an heroic attempt, but the time was not ripe for close interdenominational co-operation. With the Wesleys, surely the Moravians had a

1. Lesslie Newbigin, *Household of God* (New York: Friendship Press, 1954), 120.
2. Fries, *Moravians in Georgia*, p. 222.

great influence. John and Charles never forgot their experiences on the trans-Atlantic voyage with the Moravians. In a sense their church was begotten by Moravianism. And as for the Lutherans, Fisher[1] feels the Moravian influence tended to awaken them from their lethargy. It is surely true that by filling in temporarily for the Lutherans in Philadelphia, as their pastor, Count Zinzendorf aroused these folk to see the need for a leader who would be thoroughly acceptable to all of their faith. The subsequent arrival of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg was a monumental step toward the establishment of Lutheranism in America.

The Continuation of Colonial Emphases among the Moravians Today

For many persons it would be a severe shock to hear that around 1727 (when the Moravian revival began) Count Zinzendorf thought the Moravian movement might fulfill its mission in fifty years. By 1775 a major change of affairs took place. The first impetus was gone, but since no other organization was on the denominational entity continued. The typical plateau of institutionalism began to set in.[2] The choir system, though still retained with special usefulness to single sisters, single brothers and widows, had to be modified and eventually discarded. There were notable spurts of growth both at home and abroad, especially through the early years of the nineteenth century. But growth in the 1800's, both in Europe and in America, was never in proportion to the first upsurge, nor in America in proportion to the expanding population. There are inherent weaknesses in Moravianism that have kept the church small. During the nineteenth century one handicap was the centralization of church government in Germany. Another factor is the continuing heavy emphasis on foreign missions, which in a small denomination often eclipses opportunities for home expansion. In the third place, there was a carry-over of the Pietistic emphasis on smallness. The Moravians were to be a leaven for the whole Christian lump, cultivating the inner life and propagating

1. Fisher, *op. cit.*, p. 507.
2. Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

the gospel where others choose not to go. Proselyting was so far taboo that often Moravians have leaned over backwards and have failed to invite newcomers in their communities to unite with the church. Today the denomination is handicapped by the movements of population, which means that members moving from the old centers locate where no Moravian church has been established.

Sensing a failure of the denomination to grow toward the end of the last century, F. F. Hagen offered a five-point program by which a renewal of "the days as they were of old," could be effected:

> 1. Earnest and effectual preaching of remission of sins in the Name of Jesus. . . .
> 2. A wise and tender care of newly awakened souls. . . .
> 3. A return to the old practice of not receiving any into full communion, who have not a full assurance that their sins are forgiven. . . .
> 4. A burning desire to preach the Gospel to every creature, and the apostolic gift of effecting immediate conversions. . . .
> 5. A return of spiritual, numerical and financial prosperity.[1]

All of these suggestions offer interesting commentary on various points made above in these pages.

The continuing emphasis on foreign missionary work is the most noteworthy thing about the Moravians. Most American congregations have a missionary society or "band," missionary giving is steadily on the increase, and in the spring of 1955, when a "new" American mission field was opened in the eastern West Indies, two seasoned workers and a theological student volunteered to go into service, even though the ranks of the ministry at home were not filled. This sort of missionary energy accounts for the fact that the denomination today numbers three converts on the mission field for every member at home. It also accounts for the continuing impetus given to other churches in the realm of foreign missions by the Moravians.[2]

---

1. Hagen, *op. cit.*, pp. 237, 238.
2. According to Fries, *A Brief History of the Moravian Church*, it was a record of Moravian missions in 1792 read by William Carey and commented on by him, "See what these Moravians have done," that inspired the first notable efforts of the Baptist Missionary Society.

Doctrinally there is little change noticeable among the Moravians since 1770. Zinzendorf's idea that God is found only in and through Christ[1] has been modified, but the faith is still strongly Christ-centered. The Count was sure that a life of fellowship with the historic Jesus of the New Testament is possible,[2] and so are most contemporary Moravians. Since they believe that Christ is the main subject of the Bible, the Word is diligently perused. It is not uncommon to find a Moravian minister preaching on "Christ in the Book of Isaiah," or some other such theme. Zinzendorf, as do his spiritual descendants, tried to make the person of the Saviour real. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," John 14:9. Johannine in this sense, the Moravians are also drawn to what is called Pauline mysticism: "Christ liveth in me." As the immediate consciousness of the presence of Jesus was the great inspiration of Paul and of the 1740-1770 era, so it is sought today. Moreover, two of the significant festival days in the Moravian Church are September 16, when ordained ministers gather to have a Cup of Covenant service honoring Christ's headship over his Church, and November 13, when this same headship is celebrated by the entire congregation, usually in a love feast service and holy communion

As in Pennsylvania in the 1740's, the Brethren are ecumenically inclined, but unlike that day can offer little statesman-like leadership to the ecumenical movement. At least there is no suspicion cast upon their motives for bringing the children of God together such as was true in the Pennsylvania synods. Like Newbigin, they believe there is a profound connection between the atonement, fellowship, unity and missions.[3] Thus, by emphasizing strongly the Christ of the cross and the ever-continuing task of missions, they believe they will foster an atmosphere of fellowship and unity. Zinzendorf[4] decided that there was need for denominations until many thousands of each com-

---

1. See above, p. 71. 2. See Gapp, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
3. Newbigin, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
4. Fritz Blanke, *Zinzendorf und die Einheit der Kinder Gottes* (Basel, Heinrich Majer, 1950), p. 48.

munion were thoroughly converted. After that, he felt denominations might melt away and the apostolic church could be possible again. This dream is shared by modern Moravians too.

By the time the eighteenth century closed, some of the Unity's peculiar services had been discarded: the *pedalavium*, the kiss of peace and the *Sprechen* (personal interview before communion), although the latter is still employed in the mission fields. One distinctive service remained, the love feast. Moravians still wait for other Christians to reinstitute this biblically-warranted service as a stimulus to higher fellowship, brotherhood and understanding. They believe that a similar religious experience is a better tie of fellowship than like dogma. In the love feast, with its high brand of church music, the simple bun and beverage, they see an appropriate and inspiring means of bringing people together before God, in equality and fellowship. In 1957, when the quincentennial year of the founding of the Unitas Fratrum in Kunwald is celebrated, they hope to have a unique demonstration of the fraternal spirit that crosses international lines. A General Synod of all branches of the Unity, including Czechoslovakia and eastern Germany, is to be held in Bethlehem.

The Meaning of the Colonial Experience for Our Time

Two points need to be clarified as this last section is begun. For one thing, there was much in the colonial Moravian experience that has nothing to say to our time. Some of it was sentimental, ecstatic, introvert and fanatical. It dealt with concepts and imagery so foreign to the present day as to be meaningless. What will be considered now is selected, the portion of the experience that seems to have the possibility of being repeated today and being contemporary. Furthermore, Ronald Knox is surely correct that this experience, even when thoroughly purged of its undesirable elements, is not for all men.[1] There are millions who will never be moved by an enthusiastic religion.

On the other hand, there are other millions who remain untouched by religion, because it is offered only in cold, dry, ra-

1. Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 421.

tional form. The heart religion of the early Moravians had warmth and always had a place for the spontaneous. One was never quite sure what would happen next, even in services of worship. Count Zinzendorf might line out a brand new hymn, and the organist would have to play it in whatever key the Count began to sing. Or, in place of some other element of worship, the congregation might be asked to join in a time of prayer for some worker or evangelist who, according to a recently arrived courier, had met with an accident. A cool, calculated order of worship might be followed at the liturgy hour, but after that there would always be room for the spontaneous experience. This study, then, points to the need for a balance between the head and the heart.

Secondly, the Moravian experience from the past beckons the modern church to come, meet the needs of individuals and establish fellowship for them. The success of the choir system was that every individual counted. If a man, woman or youth had a problem, the choir elder or leader was told about it. Personal counselling and guidance were offered to all ages. The choir division threw together those whose interests were common. Free discussion was held by the group, and all joined in prayer for those who requested it. The clergy had their rightful place, but laymen were in the places of leadership suited to them, both of matters temporal and spiritual. The Kunwald tradition of the place of the laity was carefully continued. Objections like that of so many Indians, "I am not good enough to be baptized," could be handled by one layman speaking frankly to another.

Side by side with the meeting of personal needs, a broader and more meaningful fellowship in the modern church is desirable. The numbers of lonely people, both young and old, increase, yet the facilities for helping such folk are not keeping pace with the need. As Newbigin[1] points out, baptism, the Lord's Supper (the Moravians would add the love feast)—all rites of the church need to be re-examined in light of their being vital group experiences, as they were in Bible times. If communal life robs some few of their individuality, as it did in the case of Spangen-

1. Newbigin, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

berg, a true sense of community may, on the other hand, lead many to self-realization.

Another opportunity of today, in light of 1740-1770, is to unite the secular and the sacred. In the Moravian settlements one occupation was as honorable as another: farming, sewing, shoemaking, being a night watchman, whatever it might be. All was done to honor the Saviour, and there were no second class or menial tasks. The secular and sacred were united to make everything sacred. Moreover, the people were taught to realize that a healthy outward or working life helps to keep one inwardly and spiritually sound.

As for the task of evangelism, can one ever say it is finished, either in the eighteenth or twentieth century? Religious history makes it clear that revivals are needed repeatedly, not of a superficial, surface variety, but revivals that cut deeply into the habits of people and their way of life. Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell was interviewed some time ago for his opinion about the apparent religious revival in progress across the globe. He snorted. "Religion has become a fad," he said. "There's an awful lot of people joining the church, but what it means I don't know. I'm not sure it means anything. . . .It's too easy to be in the church."[1] As an evangelist, Count Zinzendorf was interested in more than the conversion of the down and out. He strove for a general revival, by which people who had a nominal Christianity might be awakened to a vital experience, and the non-confessing Christian might be led to accept Christ as Saviour. Always the adolescent decision was important. All the "psychology" of the day was directed toward helping youth gain companionship with the living Christ. This also went on to those of later years who lacked reality in their religion. Conversions often occurred, as has been noted, in the thirties and forties.

Then there is the whole concept of Christ, of God, as Saviour. The colonial Moravians referred to Christ as *Heiland*, Saviour, more often than any other way. Indeed, the term was not meant to be limited just to Jesus, but to embrace the entire saving work

---

1. "Religion," *Time Magazine*, January 17, 1955.

of the Trinity. Use of the term was so frequent as to become monotonous and almost blasphemous. However, the memorabilia of 1770 for North Carolina indicates the gradual substitution of "the heavenly Father"[1] for some of the functions of deity formerly gathered into the title "Saviour." Regularly, though, the Moravians insisted that evangelism is needed of such a solid variety that it leads men to a change of heart. Nothing less would do. Whether it was with the European brought up in a good home, the careless American on the frontier or the savage Indian in the wilderness, the message was the same: you need a Saviour from sin, from all the low things in life that would like to claim your soul, yes, from your very self.

The colonial generation would not urge salvation in order to escape hell-fire, although they may have believed in it. Nor would they limit this salvation to the future life. It begins now. But in connection with their emphasis on evangelism and salvation, they would say: "Never avoid the reality of suffering and death." A religion that avoids these profound aspects of existence can never win the day. Again, to the early Moravians, becoming a Christian was almost synonymous with the risk of suffering. Yet they affirmed their faith! And if death came, even cruel martyrdom as at Gnadenhütten, Ohio, they would say: "Here *triumphed* in death ninety Christian Indians."

Now if it is true that religious experience is best conveyed from one generation to another by the careful delineation of a key personality, let the reader's mind dwell for a few more moments on Bishop Spangenberg. It must have been clear long before this that in Spangenberg the fullest sympathies of this investigation have rested. He seems to exemplify best the essence of Moravianism, and his biographer[2] regards that essence as simplicity of heart. It was simplicity, among other things, that the Brethren lost during the Wetteravian intoxication, yet Spangenberg held on to it unswervingly. He has left a hymn about it, three stanzas of which are quoted:

---

1. Fries, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, p. 397.
2. Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

When simplicity we cherish,
  Then the soul is full of light;
But that light will quickly vanish,
  When of Jesus we lose sight.

Who sincerely loveth Jesus,
  And upon His grace depends;
Who but willeth what Him pleases,
  Simply following His commands.

Who in Jesus Christ abideth,
  And, from self-dependence free,—
In naught else but Him confideth;
  Walks in true simplicity.

The hymn (#636 in the present Moravian hymnal) was written in 1740, after his first stay in America, and was translated by an anonymous Moravian in 1746. It commends itself because it is so free of controversial doctrine. Its ideas can be grasped by a child, and it breathes an air of freshness akin to the Twenty-third Psalm.

What is simplicity? It is humility like that of a child, indispensable for Christian character, as the Beatitudes of Matthew 5 say. It involves utter trust in Jesus Christ, contentment with one's material goods, whatever they may be, willingness to see in the Scriptures the Word of God in purity and soundness, lack of personal complaint, along with calmness under pressure, and withal living on a plane of high morality. For Spangenberg it meant the avoidance of useless speaking and a dislike for titles which he had so deservingly earned: Master of Arts and Bishop of the Unity. He believed that if religion were cultivated in its simplicity, with first things emphasized first, a unity of believers would surely take place. To be appreciated, all of this must be placed beneath the name of the man who was the genius of the Moravian settlements, the warm-hearted counsellor of both the well-educated and the ignorant, and the composer of the only widely recognized statement of Moravian doctrine, *Idea Fidei Fratrum*.

Summary

The religious experience revealed in this study, then, was of two main types: the so-called Wetteravian, and that which Spangenberg, above all others, exemplified. Wetteravianism developed out of the worst side of Zinzendorf. Expressions used by him demonstrating objectively the power of Christ's atonement were carried to extremes. Not only the suffering, but the wounds of Christ were emphasized as bringing blessing to the faithful—the side-wounds, and the juice from the hole in his side. If this seemed poetic and artistic to the Count, it was surely not used that way by associates of his like his son, Christian Renatus, Cammerhof, de Watteville and John Nitschmann. They indulged in prosaic and literalistic use of the language *ad nauseam*.

Moreover, Wetteravianism developed a fanaticism of deed as well as word. Christian Renatus refused to marry, directing his sex interests, instead, toward an organization among the single brethren at Herrnhaag known as the "society of sweethearts." This was at least mildly a homosexual perversion that came to an end none too soon with the closing of Herrnhaag. When the fanaticism reached America, it upset the Bethlehem community thoroughly for a time, then gradually faded out with the aid of Cammerhof's removal by death and John Nitschmann's by transfer, and especially with the aid of Spangenberg's return to full supervision.

Spangenberg's experience, which prevailed over the other, did not ripen over night. His soul wrestled long with the tendency toward both separatism and celibacy. His first years in Pennsylvania witnessed so much evidence of confusion resulting from separatism that he came to value established churches much more highly. Moreover, life among the Schwenkfelder as well as later developments at Christiansbrunn made him minimize the virtues of celibacy. As for fanaticism, he found it was best curbed by a sane and intelligent approach to religion. Emotion he could tolerate, but not emotionalism; child-likeness, but not childishness. And his way prevailed!

Thus Moravian religious experience ran out of reasonable and acceptable bounds for a time, but recovered its balance and dignity by the end of the Spangenberg and Böhler era. Hard work demanded by the American frontier, coupled with latent Anglo-Saxon good sense, eventually carried the day.

Finally, these people, by the tangible example of the Pennsylvania synods and their whole general spirit suggest a new level of interdenominational co-operation: a sharing of religious experience based on a dynamic approach to the Bible and upon group prayer. Efforts of this nature have been made in our time by such men as Samuel Shoemaker and Frank Laubach. Among other things, they have promoted prayer cells and across-sectarian discussions "for the heart." In the next period of years, religious experience, alongside of creed, may become a new bond of church union.

Editor's note:—(see page 61) Wesley was not on this ship, but was with the second colony of Moravians enroute to Georgia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Sources

Ames, Edward Scribner. *The Psychology of Religious Experience.* New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1910.

Dotterer, Henry S. *Rev. John Philip Boehm.* Philadelphia: no publisher given, 1890.

Edwards, Jonathan. *The Treatise on Religious Affections.* New York: American Tract Society, no date.

Fisher, George P. *History of the Christian Church.* New York: Scribner's 1887.

Hinke, William J. *Life and Letters of the Rev. John Philip Boehm.* Philadelphia: Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church in America, 1916.

James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience.* New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1928.

Knox, R. A. *Enthusiasm.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A History of Christianity.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

———. *A History of the Expansion of Christianity,* Vol. III. New York: Harper's, 1939.

McNeill, John. *Makers of Christianity.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1935.

Newbigin, Lesslie. *Household of God.* New York: Friendship Press, 1954.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. *The Kingdom of God in America* Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1937.

Pinson, Koppel S. *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.

Sachse, Julius F. *The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania,* Vol. I. Philadelphia: P. C. Stockhausen, 1899.

Schweitzer, Albert. *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle,* translated by William Montgomery. London: A. and C. Black, 1931.

Sessler, Jacob John. *Communal Pietism among Early American Moravians.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.

Smith, de Cost. *Martyrs of the Oblong and Little Nine.* Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1948.

Spinka, Matthew. *That Incomparable Moravian.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Stace, W. T. *Time and Eternity.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Thompson, A. M. *Great Missionaries.* London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1862.

von Hügel, Friederich. *The Mystical Element of Religion,* Vol. II. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1908.

Walker, Williston. *Great Men of the Christian Church.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

———. *A History of the Christian Church.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Wallace, Paul A. W. *Conrad Weiser.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945.

Wright, C. J. *Comenius and the Church Universal.* London: Herbert Barber, no date.

Moravian Sources

Addison, W. G. *The Renewed Church of the United Brethren.* London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1932.
Albright, S. C. *The Story of the Moravian Congregation at York, Pennsylvania.* York, Pa.: The Maple Press, 1927.
Clewell, John Henry. *History of Wachovia in North Carolina.* New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1902.
de Schweinitz, Edmund. *History of the Unitas Fratrum.* Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Concern, 1901.
———. *The Life and Times of David Zeisberger.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1870.
Fries, Adelaide and others. *A Brief History of the Moravian Church.* Raleigh, N. C.: Edwards and Broughton Printing Company, 1909.
———. *Customs and Practices of the Moravian Church.* Winston-Salem, N. C.: Comenius Press, 1949.
———. *The Moravians in Georgia.* Raleigh, N. C.: Edwards and Broughton, 1905.
———. *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina,* Vol. I. Raleigh, N. C.: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1922.
Hagen, F. F. *Old Landmarks.* Bethlehem, Pa.: no publisher given, 1886.
Hamilton J. Taylor. *A History of the Moravian Church.* Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Company, 1900.
———. *A History of the Missions of the Moravian Church.* Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Co., 1901.
———. *The Moravian Manual.* 3rd ed. Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Company, 1901.
Hamilton, Kenneth G. *John Ettwein and the Moravian Church during the Revolutionary Period.* Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Company, 1940.
Hutton, J. *A History of the Moravian Church.* London: Moravian Publication Office, 1909.
———. *A History of Moravian Missions.* London: Moravian Publication Office, 1922.
Hymns and Liturgies of the Moravian Church. Bethlehem, Pa.: Published by the Synod of the Moravian Church, 1920.
Ledderhose, Charles T. *The Life of Augustus Gottlieb Spangenberg.* London: William Mallalieu and Company, 1855.
Levering, J. Mortimer. *A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.* Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Company, 1903.
Pond, Enoch. *Memoir of Count Zinzendorf.* Boston: Massachusetts Sabbath School Society, 1851.
Reichel, Levin T. *The Early History of the Church of the United Brethren.* Nazareth, Pa.: Moravian Historical Society, 1888.
Reichel, W. C. *Memorials of the Moravian Church.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1870.
Ritter, Abraham. *History of the Moravian Church in Philadelphia.* Philadelphia; Hayes and Zell, 1857.
Schwarze, W. N. *John Hus.* New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1915.
Spangenberg, August G. *The Life of Nicholas Lewis, Count Zinzendorf.* Translated by Samuel Jackson. London: Samuel Holdsworth, 1838.
Weinland, Joseph E *The Romantic Story of Schoenbrunn.* Dover, Ohio: Seibert Printing Company, 1930.
Zinzendorf, N. L. *Maxims, Theological Ideas and Sentences, out of the Present Ordinary of the Brethren's Churches.* Edited by John Gambold. London: J. Beecroft, 1751.

Sources in German

Arnold, Gottfried. *Historie und Beschreibung der mystischen Theologie; oder geheimen Gotteslehrheit.* Leipzig: no publisher given, 1738. Second edition.

Bettermann, Wilhelm. *Theologie und Sprache bei Zinzendorf.* Gotha. Leopold Klotz Verlag, 1935.

Blanke, Fritz, *Zinzendorf und die Einheit der Kinder Gottes.* Basel: Heinrich Majer, 1950.

Dilthey, W., ed. *Aus Schleiermacher's Leben in Briefen.* Berlin: 1858-1863 Vol. 1.

Hennig, Liemar. *Kirche und Offenbarung bei Zinzendorf.* Zurich: University of Zurich, 1938.

Herpel, Otto, ed. *Zinzendorf über Glauben und Leben.* Berlin: no publisher given, 1925.

Hök, Gösta. *Zinzendorf's Begriff der Religion.* Uppsala: Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift, 1948.

Reichel, Gerhard. *August Gottlieb Spangenberg, Bischof der Brüderkirche.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, publisher, 1906.

Renkewitz, Heinz. *War Zinzendorf ein Spiritualist?* No place or publisher given, 1950.

Römer, Hermann. *Nicholaus Ludwig Graf von Zinzendorf.* Gnadau: Verlag der Unitats-Buchhandlung, 1900.

Uttendörfer, Otto. *Zinzendorf und die Mystik.* Berlin-Dahlem: Christliche Zeitschriftenverlag, 1950.

Articles

De Schweinitz, Edmund. "The Life of John Christoph Cammerhof," *Transactions of the Moravian Historical* Society, Vol. II, pp. 177-183.

Grünberg, P. "Pietism," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.* Vol. IX, p. 56.

Jannasch, W. "Christian Renatus Graf von Zinzendorf," *Zeitschrift für Brüdergeschichte,* II (1908), 45-68; III (1909), 66-89.

Lauchert, Friedrich. "Pietism," *The Catholic Encyclopedia.* Vol. XII, p. 81.

Lowry, C. H., Jr. "Zinzendorf," *Encyclopedia of Religion,* p. 840. Vergilius Ferm, Editor.

Mirbt, Earl. "Pietism," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.* Vol. IX, p. 66.

Müller, Josef. "Zinzendorf," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.* Vol. XII, p. 515.

Schmidt, Martin. "Die Okumenische Bedeutung John Wesley's," *Theologische Literaturzeitung,* August-September, 1953, Col. 451.

Schmieder, H. E. "Zinzendorf," *Lives of the Leaders of Our Church Universal.* Edited by Ferdinand Piper. *Later Leaders,* p. 475.

Time magazine for January 17, 1955. Article, "Religion."

Waterhouse, E. A., "Pietism," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.* Vol. X, pp. 6, 7.

Wilhelm, J. "Zinzendorf," *The Catholic Encyclopedia.* Vol. II, p. 618.

Manuscript Sources

The following diaries of persons and places are all deposited in the Archives of the Moravian Church in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, except for the Christiansbrunn diary.

Diary of the Journey of Bishop Cammerhof and Brother Gottlieb Bezoldt to Wechquadnach and Pachgatgoch, from February 23 to March 22, 1749.

Diary of the Moravian settlement at Christiansbrunn near Nazareth, Pennsylvania, in possession of the Nazareth church. Translation in part by Frederick Schramm.

Supplement to the Diary of the Indian Mission, Fairfield, Ontario, Canada.

Diary of the Moravian Indian Mission, Gnadenhütten, Ohio.

Diary of the Moravian Indian Mission, Gnadenhütten, Pennsylvania.

Diary of the Moravian Indian Mission, Goschgoschünk, Pennsylvania.

Diary of the Moravian Indian Mission, Langundo Utenünk, Pennsylvania.

Diary of the Moravian Indian Mission, Lichtenau, Ohio.

Diary of the Moravian Indian Mission on Province Island, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Diary of the Moravian Indian Mission at New Schönbrunn, Ohio.

Diary of the Moravian Indian Mission at Schönbrunn, Ohio.

Diary of the Moravian Indian Mission at Wechquetank, Pennsylvania.

The two following miscellaneous manuscripts are also deposited in the Archives at Bethlehem:

Catalogus derer von unsern Brüdern getauften Indianen des Nordlichen Theils von America, compiled by John Ettwein and others.

Solemnia Funeralia, etc. by John Brownfield.

The following persons have their memoirs or *Lebenslaüfe* extant in either the Bethlehem or Salem, North Carolina Archives collections:

Baumgarten, Johann G. (Salem)
Enerson, Maria Margaret (Bethlehem)
Fockel, Gottlieb (Salem)
Gross, Andreas (Salem)
Hege, Johann Balthasar (Salem)
Herbst, Johann H. (Salem)
Kremser, Rosina (Bethlehem)
Lung, Jacob (Salem)
Merkle, Christoph (Salem)
Meyer, Jacob (Salem)
Meyer, Philip (Bethlehem)
Münster, Melchior (Salem)
Nagel, Johannes (Salem)
Petersen, Hans (Bethlehem)
Pfeil, Friedrich Jacob (Salem)
Rillman, Andrew (Bethlehem)
Säutter, Johann Michael (Salem)
Schober, Gottlieb (in possession of the family, Salem)
Schwarz, Christian (Bethlehem)
Schwarz, Gottfried (Bethlehem)
Seifart, Andreas (Bethlehem)
Stauber, Paul Christian (Salem)
Tanneberger, Anna Rosina (Bethlehem)
Weinland, Johann Nicholas (Bethlehem)

Miscellaneous Sources

Gapp, Samuel H., "Zinzendorf on Reason Religion and Heart Religion." Unpublished manuscript, written in May, 1950.

Gapp, Samuel H., Jr. "The Story of 'The Power of the Gospel' by Schuessele." Unpublished manuscript written in 1954.

Goerner, Walter J. "Die Bedeutung August Hermann Franckes für das Erziehungswesen." Unpublished thesis submitted at Frankenhain, Thuringen, 1942.

Laantee, Karl. "Philipp Jakob Spener." Unpublished manuscript submitted to Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1953.

Neisser, George, translator. "An Authentic Relation of the Occasion, Continuance and Conclusion of the First Assembly, etc." An account of the first of the Pennsylvania Synods, written about 1742.

Uwoki, Tadakazu. "The Significance of Philipp Jakob Spener in the Development of Protestant Thought." Unpublished thesis submitted to Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1924.

Weinlick, John R. "The Moravian Diaspora," a study of the societies of the Moravian Church within the Protestant state churches of Europe. Unpublished dissertation submitted to Columbia University, 1952.

THE 103rd ANNUAL MEETING

of the

MORAVIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY

October 13, 1960

The 103rd annual meeting of the Moravian Historical Society met in the Whitefield House, Nazareth, Pennsylvania, on October 13, 1960, at 10:00 A.M. with President John R. Weinlick presiding. There were fourteen members present. The reading of the minutes of the previous annual meeting were omitted by unanimous consent, as they had been read and approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting on January 14, 1960.

The treasurer's report as of October 1, 1960, showed a balance of cash on hand of $1,237.13. Market value of investments were reported to be $20,327.00. Trust funds amounted to $12,733.05. On motion by Taylor, seconded by Desh, the treasurer's report was accepted and approved.

Walter Peters reporting for the Library Committee spoke of the cooperation between the Society and the Nazareth Moravian Church. He asked for permission to give to the Church certain items which it had originally given to the Society, or which it had restored for display in the Museum. It was felt that these would be put to better use in the recently renovated facilities of the Church, and for the Church to thus use them would be in keeping with the purposes of the Historical Society. These items are a grandfather's clock, a cupboard, a small pine Bible stand, another cupboard known as a kas, and an early Sheritan Settee. Also included in this request from the Library Committee was permission to lend the Hagen portrait to the Nazareth Church. On motion by Swavely, seconded by Taylor, this request, with the reservation that if these items were no longer wanted by the Church they are to be returned to the Historical Society.

Peters also reported that the Nazareth Church had given to the Society an old music book, a glass container, a schoolmaster's desk, an early diener's coffee pot. He presented to the Society an early pewter Communion chalice from the Labrador Moravian

Mission donated by Dr. John Frauenfelter who had received it from Miss Kate Hettash of the Labrador Mission.

Upon motion by Taylor, seconded by Swavely, a collection of old music from the Nazareth Moravian Church was donated to the Moravian Music Foundation.

The Rev. E. H. Swavely, reporting as Librarian and Curator, stated that 550 guests had visited the Museum during the past year and that several good sized groups have future appointments for a visit. Sale of publications brought in $97.00 during the year. He reported that the Women's Guild had organized for the coming year with Mary Altemose as president and Carolyn Wunderly as secretary.

The Rev. R. H. Brennecke, residing in Connecticut, reported that together with Dr. Olson, Archaeologist for the State of New York, he had visited early Moravian mission sites on the border territory of western Connecticut and eastern New York. He referred to the paper by Robert Frick on the Shekomeko and Wechquadnach stations, read before the Society in 1951. Brother Brennecke stated that he hoped that interest and action called for in the paper be followed up. He suggested that the Graveyard Committee should visit the monuments at Shekomeko and Wechquadnach, erected by the Society in 1859, with a view to repairing them, and report back to the Executive Committee. On motion of Nehring, seconded by Hedgecock, it was agreed to appoint a committee of two or three to act with the Graveyard Committee and visit the sites and determine the cost of restoring the monuments and sites and report back to the Executive Committee.

The Rev. Henry Williams, secretary of the Publications Committee, reported that Volume XVII, Part 2, was ready for distribution today. It was agreed that the sale price of Part 2 be $1.00 per copy.

The Rev. Allen Hedgecock brought the attention of the Publication Committee to a paper prepared by Eunice Weber concerning her father's missionary work in the Ozark Mountains. It was agreed to contact her and survey the material for possible publication by our Society.

The Nominating Committee consisting of the Rev. Allen Hedgecock and the Rev. John Fliegel, offered in nomination for re-election all the officers and committees of the preceding year. There were no nominations from the floor and the secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for the following:

President Emeritus	— The Rt. Rev. S. H. Gapp
President	— The Rev. Dr. John R. Weinlick
Vice-Presidents	— Prof. H. H. Beck, The Rt. Rev. Kenneth G. Hamilton, Andrew G. Kern, Walter L. Peters.
Secretary	— William H. Kortz
Treasurer	— William E. Henry
Librarian & Curator	— The Rev. Edward H. Swavely
Board of Managers	— Robert J. Desh, John E. Leibfried, Robert S. Taylor, Jr., The Rev. Henry L. Williams, George W. Hahn
Publication Committee	— The Rev. Dr. John R. Weinlick, The Rt. Rev. Kenneth G. Hamilton, the Rt. Rev. S. H. Gapp, Henry B. Rau, The Rev. Henry L. Williams.
Library Committee	— Walter L. Peters, George W. Hahn, The Rev. Dr. Samuel Zeller, Elizabeth Bahnsen, The Rev. Dr. John R. Weinlick, Mrs. Walter L. Peters, The Rev. Edward H. Swavely, Mrs. Nathan Brobst, Mary Henry Stites, Mrs. Elizabeth Morris, Matthew Morris, The Rev. Dr. Edwin A. Sawyer, Dr. Richmond Myers, The Rev. Allen Hedgecock
Graveyard Committee	— George W. Hahn, R. F. Ziegler, J. Frederick Knecht, Frank Seyfried.

The following were proposed for membership: Mrs. William Frey, Mrs. E. F. Martin, The Rev. Vernon Nelson, Mrs. Ray Dimmick, Millard Rice, Grace Nitzschke, Eleanor Nitzschke.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon in anticipation of the luncheon and vesper.

The Vesper Meeting

Luncheon was served by the Society members of the Nazareth Moravian Church, preceded by Moravian Chorales played by a Trombone Choir composed of members of the Schoeneck and Nazareth Churches. This meeting was opened by Dr. John Weinlick in the new Fellowship Hall of the Nazareth Moravian Church.

Introduced as guests were missionaries Mrs. Howard Stortz and Thelma Good from Nicaragua and the Rev. and Mrs. Peter Gubi, Jr., from the West Indian Province of the Moravian Church. Dr. Raymond Haupert presented as his guests, a number of students from the Moravian Theological Seminary.

Dr. Weinlick introduced the first speaker for the afternoon: Dr. Edwin W. Kortz, Executive Secretary of the Foreign Mission Board of the American Moravian Church, who presented a paper on "The Liturgical Development of the American Moravian Church." He traced the history of the church from it's position as a communal settlement to a modern Protestant denomination, with accompanying effects on the liturgy and worship of the church. The church he said is a denomination and not a sect or cult. It has developed a form of worship which relects the influence of the Reformation movement in Europe as well as German pietism and the American independent thinking.

A second paper was presented by the Rev. John Fliegel on "The Influence of Zinzendorf on the Present Day Moravian Church". The occasion calling for this presentation was the 200 anniversary of Count Zinzendorf's death. He said "the Moravian Church in it's most characteristic features shows the coinage of Count Zinzendorf's genius. He spoke of him as one of the ancestors of the ecumenical movement of the present day. In that respect Rev. Fliegel said he was 200 years ahead of his time. He referred to the missionary zeal which was the main characteristic of Zinzendorf, the founder of the Renewed Moravian Church.

A hymn was sung in memory of those members who had departed this life during the past year. They were: Ralph L. Beckel, Miss Mary E. Bennett, The Rev. W. J. Goerner, Mrs. Rose S. K. Heine, Mrs. Ella Loux, Herbert A. Pfohl, The Rev. Allen P. Zimmerman.

W. H. Kortz, Secretary.